

West Virginia has said that he would object to such a request, if I made it.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, I would object to a request for a final vote on the bill itself at the time suggested.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHERRY. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia, if I may do so with the permission of the Senator from Nebraska—

Mr. WHERRY. Certainly.

Mr. MORSE. I should like to ask the Senator from West Virginia what time, if any, he would agree to have a final vote taken on the bill.

Mr. REVERCOMB. From my own point of view, I feel that between Friday and sometime on Wednesday we might work out an agreement as to a time for a final vote on Wednesday; and if Senators desire to fix a time on Wednesday, I would make no objection, as I view the matter at this time. That would give an additional day on the amendments.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I feel that we should proceed under the first part of the agreement. I understand that it has been ordered that the Senate will vote on the so-called Ball amendment at 1 o'clock tomorrow, and that the time between 11 o'clock a. m. and 1 o'clock p. m. tomorrow will be divided equally between the proponents and the opponents of the amendment, and that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] will have charge of the time for the proponents and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] will have charge of the time for the opponents; and after the vote is taken at 1 o'clock, we shall proceed with the amendments, which may then be pending.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I give notice that the Senate will remain in session tomorrow night if it is impossible to finish voting on the amendments tomorrow afternoon.

RECESS

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate take a recess until tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 8 (legislative day of April 21), 1947:

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Otto Schoen, of Missouri, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Missouri, vice William B. Fahy, term expired.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 8, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of all grace and mercy, vouchsafe to keep us this day without sin, that we may pledge a sincere dedication to

our country and its vital needs. Grant us deeper thoughts and experiences of Thine own divine nature, out of which have sprung the affections of men and of angels. O stir in us that quality of character, that sturdy courage, which will make us superior to all circumstances.

Dear Lord, in the hours of memory there haunt us duties undone, deeds neglected, and acts unworthy; O forgive us and grant unto us strength to be equal to the unprecedented tasks before us. Make us messengers to homeless hearts, to loveless lives, and to the multitudes without a compass, that we may walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing, being fruitful in every good work, and Thine shall be the praise forever, in the name of Him who is our eternal hope. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include an editorial on the late Charles L. Gerlach.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I was given permission to extend my remarks in the Record and include certain matter. I am informed by the Public Printer that this will exceed two pages of the Record and will cost \$248.50, but I ask unanimous consent that it be printed notwithstanding that fact.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, notwithstanding the cost, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include two letters.

Mr. CURTIS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include two letters.

Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record and include a statement made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] upon the observance of the birthday anniversary of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the Record and include a letter from the Young Women's Christian Association, which letter is addressed to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]. I have his permission to put this in.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

THEY SPEAK FOR AMERICA

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the four teen-age Americans who Tuesday afternoon relighted the torch of American patriotism. By their own reaction to a Communist

Party line speech deriding America, they proved that love of God, love of country, and love of the American Constitution and flag are still the paramount emotions in the hearts of young Americans.

These four young Americans, three girls and a boy, walked out on a eulogy of Russia and Russian communism. They demanded that pro-Russianism, procommunism, and un-Americanism bordering on sedition be barred from American schools. They protested against being forced by their principal to listen to statements that they recognized as false about the superiority of life in Soviet Russia compared to life in our own United States.

They had not read the remarks made by my distinguished colleague from New York, the Honorable DANIEL A. REED, on the floor of this House when he pointed out that the average wage of workers in the United States is \$46.40 per week, as against \$14.40 in Russia.

From their own knowledge of their own country, however, they knew that the pro-Soviet utterances of Mrs. Aleksandra Pavlovna Lewis, Russian-born, and an invited guest at their school, were the baldest form of lies and propaganda. They did what all red-blooded Americans should do under similar circumstances. They refused to give the consent of silence. They walked out.

Their action was as dynamic and can well be as far-reaching in effect in 1947 as was the Boston Tea Party, which first showed the temper of the people of the United States in regard to personal freedom.

For 14 years the educational system of the United States under the New Deal has been drugged by the enforced opiate of so-called progressive education. For 14 years the communistic thinking of the New Deal has recognized Russia, fostered communistic ideologies, and sought to plant in the minds of an entire generation of young Americans a willingness to accept internationalism, communism, and total regimentation of the people.

Through the American Student Union, the American Youth Congress, the Young Communist League, and more recently American Youth for Democracy, the international educational agencies of the Comintern have sought to kill patriotism in America.

The action of these four students at Western High School Tuesday proves that the torch of liberty still burns brightly in the minds of American youth. Their act must not be allowed to pass without fitting recognition by the House of Representatives—the directly elected representatives of the American people. We know from the reaction of the people at the polls last November that we are through with communism within these United States. I am glad to know these four young people will be honored by the Members of this House early next week in a fitting manner.

And we can well thank God for this proof that the little red schoolhouse has not become the big Red school system.

MISLEADING PROPAGANDA

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the public and Members of Congress are being bombarded with half-truths and falsehoods. For instance, it is urged that Cuba is the only dependable source of sugar for the United States and, therefore, should be given a near monopoly of that market. Proponents of this falsehood cite the wartime sugar record of our domestic areas and claim that this demonstrates the undependability of domestic producers as sources of sugar.

WAR RECORD

First, here is the record of sugar production since the outbreak of World War II compared with the prewar average—in short tons, raw value:

Year	Cuba	Domestic	
		Cane sugar	Beet sugar
1935-39 average.....	3,128	2,385	1,520
1940.....	3,127	2,335	1,897
1941.....	2,734	2,306	1,588
1942.....	3,800	2,479	1,726
1943.....	3,230	2,466	998
1944.....	4,738	2,039	1,056
1945.....	3,923	2,258	1,278
1946.....	4,476	2,026	1,551

Now, let us see what happened. In 1940, the first year of the war, the domestic beet area set a new production record. During the first 3 years of World War II, this domestic area maintained its output above prewar average. Cane-sugar production, in contrast, did not increase until 1942, the third year of the war; in fact, it decreased in 1941, especially in Cuba. Since 1941 Cuban production has been above prewar, but with sharp fluctuations, which certainly do not demonstrate unusual dependability. Production in the domestic cane-sugar areas since 1943 has been reduced by unfavorable weather in Puerto Rico, Florida, and Louisiana by a labor shortage and a strike in Hawaii in 1946, and generally by the impact of the war on these sugar-cane producers in a country fully at war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Boston Herald May 7 relating to T. Bertram King, Director of the Loan Guarantee Section of the Veterans' Administration; a letter from the East Boston Social Centers Council; a letter from the Jewish War Veterans of the United States; and a resolution adopted by the Board of Aldermen of the City of Chelsea, Mass., all endorsing the Taft-Ellender-Wagner general housing bill, and all of which I agree with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a statement.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a brilliant speech by my illustrious predecessor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in Plain Talk.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 52]

Bates, Mass.	Gifford	O'Toole
Bell	Gregory	Ploeser
Bland	Gwynne, Iowa	Powell
Bulwinkle	Harness, Ind.	Preston
Camp	Hart	St. George
Canfield	Hartley	Scoblick
Chapman	Hinshaw	Scott
Chilperfield	Jones, Wash.	Hugh D. Jr.
Clements	Kearns	Sheppard
D'Alesandro	Kelley	Simpson, Pa.
Dawson, Ill.	McDowell	Smith, Maine
Dawson, Utah	McGarvey	Taylor
Dingell	Macy	Thomas, N. J.
Dirksen	Mansfield, Tex.	Tibbott
Domenegeaux	Meade, Ky.	Vinson
Elliott	Miller, Nebr.	West
Ellsworth	Mitchell	Wolverton
Fenton	Morrison	
Fuller	O'Hara	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ABERNETHY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mr. MACKINNON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD in five instances and include two resolutions adopted by the Minnesota Legislature, two editorials, and a telegram.

Mr. BEALL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial appearing in the Cumberland News.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include three editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain tables and documents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I intend to make in the Committee of the Whole today and include certain newspaper clippings and other data.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had completed the reading of the first section of the bill.

The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after "paragraph", insert a colon and the following: "Provided, however, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that today is the sixty-third birthday of the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman. The policy on which he is now embarking is the most significant, probably, that America has ever undertaken. It is going to do one of two things: It is going to make Harry Truman one of the great men of all history, if he follows through and cleans out communism in this country, or if he fails to do that, if he fails to follow through, it will probably have exactly the opposite effect.

Christian civilization and atheistic communism cannot long continue the way we are going. I wish you would look at the Washington Post of this morning. I feel like dubbing that publication the American Pravda. On the front page it has the picture of a Communist propagandist who went out here and insulted the students at Western High School on yesterday. On another page it has an advertisement of a Com-

munist meeting here tonight. This Communist meeting is brought here for the purpose of trying to intimidate the Congress of the United States.

The measure now before the House, which President Truman has recommended, definitely lines him up on the side of those of us who have been fighting this Communist menace for years. If he will just follow through and help us to drive this pernicious influence from American soil, he will have saved our Christian civilization, and as I said, will go down in history as one of the great leaders of all time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, what I have to say in connection with the subject matter of my remarks is said without rancor or ill feeling, but I believe it is my duty to bring to the attention of the House and to explain to my colleagues who requested time yesterday just what the situation was when debate was closed. It was the understanding that the opposition was to have 3 hours. At the beginning of the session on yesterday, the clerk of our committee advised me that on the majority side we were entitled to 51 minutes and from the minority side we were entitled to 73 minutes, and he suggested that I submit the names of those who were to speak in opposition. I submitted those lists to both the majority and minority leaders. The majority leader fulfilled his obligation under that agreement explicitly. The opposition received 51 minutes from the majority side. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] refused to recognize the list that I submitted to him, and when the time had expired there were still 19 minutes due the opposition.

I call your attention to the fact that as the debate closed the distinguished former Speaker and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] were both given, I believe, 18 minutes of time. There was no time for the opposition. The House should know that because I believe an agreement has been violated, contrary to the understanding between the parties.

I make that explanation because there were six or seven men on our side who wanted to speak and who had no opportunity to do so.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I know the gentleman did not intend to say that the minority side did not recognize any of the men on his list because I am sure he will recall that some were.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I did not say that, my distinguished friend.

Mr. JARMAN. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. You did recognize the opposition to the extent of some 48 minutes, but that still left us 19 minutes in the hole.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. EATON. I understand that the gentleman absolves the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Yes, indeed; I said you fulfilled your agreement explicitly.

Mr. EATON. I sincerely thank the gentleman for that bill of health.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I hope that as debate now proceeds under the 5-minute rule there is going to be no effort to shut off the opposition. Hardly a man who stood in the well of this House has failed to call attention to the seriousness of this situation. Even under the rule only 9 hours is allowed to debate this important problem. In the past we have spent as much as 20 hours on other matters which were only half as important as this. So I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that we can have plenty of time under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. I regret very much there was a misunderstanding yesterday but the misunderstanding came about in this manner: Anyone who came to me from the opposition, I granted time. I was looking for people on the opposition in order to give them time. The mistake I made, if it was a mistake, was that I thought everyone had to come to me and ask for time, and I gave them time. Let me say to the gentleman that I had given out all of my time when I came to this table yesterday morning. Shortly after that the gentleman sent a list around and I told him that was not the way I understood the agreement. I am very sorry that I did not have the names the gentleman had on his list, but I had no more time. I gave the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] 20 minutes. I certainly would not have given him 20 minutes had I known you wanted time for other speakers. I just want to say, if there was a mistake made, I yielded to everyone on this side who came to me and asked for time. I did not know the gentleman had a list over there.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH] has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SMITH]?

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I wish to make this statement: The gentleman fully understands, of course, the difficulty the chairman has in trying to give time to the very large number on our side who wish to speak. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that the House owes it to the gentleman from Wisconsin and those associated with him in their attitude toward this bill that he have this time now. I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the Committee at this time grant the gentleman the 19 minutes for use as he sees fit.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, with all due deference to my distinguished chairman, I think that is out of order, and that we should proceed under the 5-minute rule. This is water over the dam. I would like to say to the dis-

tinguished minority leader that we want to be fair, but you did recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD], the gentleman from Utah [Mr. GRANGER], and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], and we still had 19 minutes coming.

Mr. BLOOM. I am sorry; that was not my understanding.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, it is always unfortunate that in the affairs of the House of Representatives any misunderstanding in respect to time should arise. However, it seems to have arisen on this occasion, as it has on other occasions during the time I have been here.

I would like to make this suggestion to the gentleman: As far as I know, there is no inclination to push this measure through without full and adequate time under the 5-minute rule for discussion of the various proposals and amendments that will be made, and opportunity afforded Members to speak on the measure as they see fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. I know of no reason why consideration of the bill in the Committee cannot proceed through the day and through tomorrow, if that is necessary, in order that Members may have full and complete opportunity to present their views on this very important matter, while at the same time we make reasonable progress in consideration and final action on the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I thank the distinguished gentleman. I would like to suggest to my leader, however, that in this matter of time, the Rules Committee should fix the limitations and fix the conditions when situations like this arise.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, while the House is considering the very important request of the President for a \$400,000,000 loan to Greece and Turkey, it is necessary that we of the Congress carefully inquire into all aspects of the Middle East situation and particularly the current financial condition of Greece, the principal recipient of the proposed aid. It is particularly important that the Greek Government be required, as a condition of the

pending loan, to tax every available source of income. For this purpose I want to call to the attention of the Congress a situation permitting Greek nationals living in the United States to evade taxes, which I believe should be corrected.

There are living in the United States a considerable number of Greek nationals engaged in business who are not subject to income taxation by any country under present law. The Greek Government does not tax its citizens living abroad. Apparently the United States Government is unable to do so, in many instances, because of present loopholes in the Federal income-tax laws. It is only just and right that these Greek nationals should be required to make tax contributions for the governmental services and benefits which they enjoy while living in our country.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I yield.

Mr. O'KONSKI. I might also add that the Greek Government does not even tax its citizens at home.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. I am not dealing with that matter now, I am dealing with those Greek nationals who are living in the United States.

Also, at a time when their country is in a very precarious financial condition and is asking the people of the United States for help, these Greek citizens should bear their share of the burden. Mr. Maximos, the Prime Minister of Greece, has expressed his country's willingness to fully cooperate with the United States and to work toward correcting any inequities which exist at this time. I believe both Governments will be not only willing but anxious to correct this tax situation, which has heretofore been overlooked.

At this time I would like to tell you gentlemen about the aspect of this situation, with which I am most familiar. The tax evasion I have described is especially noteworthy in the field of shipping. Greek shipowners, before the war, operated very extensively under the Panamanian flag, through Panamanian corporations which they owned and controlled. Substantial tonnage was also operated under the Greek flag. Under a series of international treaties made pursuant to section 212 of the Internal Revenue Code, the United States has for many years exempted the income of Panamanian, Greek, and other foreign shipowners from taxation within this country, in return for reciprocal exemptions from taxation to American shipowners on profits earned from activities outside the United States. These international agreements were intended to avoid the danger of double taxation, but they have been misused so as to provide the equivalent of tax exemption. This abuse should be stopped. Thus, in the case of Greek shipowners operating under Greek and Panamanian flags, these exemptions have operated as one-way streets. The Greek shipowners were exempted from taxes otherwise payable to the United States, although American shipowners received no benefits, because

no taxes would have been levied in Greece or Panama. Moreover, through the device of Panamanian operation and residence outside of Greece, Greek-owned vessels, in many cases, escaped requisition by Greece during the war. They were brought into the Allied shipping pool only after the United States and Panama became belligerents.

From the information I have received, it is apparent that wealthy Greek shipowners are now reinvesting their war-swollen profits, upon which no taxes have ever been paid to any government, in ships purchased from the Maritime Commission under the Ships Sales Act. Approximately 100 of these ships are planned for operation under the Greek flag and I believe that a similar number have been or will be purchased for operation under the Panamanian flag. Because of the low wages and other reduced operating costs, owners of these Greek and Panamanian vessels are now earning fabulous profits. Many of these owners reside in the United States. Panama has no income tax law. I believe that, except for trivial amounts, these shipowners have successfully evaded payment of taxes to the United States as well as to their own impoverished homeland. Profits earned by Panamanian corporations are allowed to accumulate to the credit of the corporations. These funds ultimately are withdrawn in the form of loans which are, in reality, disguised dividends, or are reinvested in additional tonnage or are otherwise transferred to safe custody of the beneficial owners without payment of an income tax thereon.

To be fair, I regret that I must state, while the subject is being discussed, that in some cases it appears that American citizens have attempted to use Panamanian corporations in order to escape payment of taxes to our Government. I appreciate that there may be sound operating reasons for operation of some ships under the Panamanian flag, but it is apparent that, in certain cases, the American shipowners practiced this device primarily to avoid payment of taxes to our country. This abuse should be corrected also.

I am confident that millions of dollars of tax revenue will result from the imposition of taxes upon the amassed wealth of those Greek millionaires and the inflated income of those Greek citizens now residing in New York and other cities. If we are to provide relief, we must make it our business to see to it that the beneficiaries of our relief exercise the maximum degree of self-help. We must insist upon their doing all in their power to help themselves. Greece should be required to enforce democratic responsibilities upon its citizens as a condition of our loan to them. Particularly I refer to the responsibility to finance their government to the utmost of their ability, which is especially vital during this critical period.

I am writing today to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue asking that an investigation of this matter be made immediately, that any violations of existing tax laws by these people be immediately stopped and prosecuted, and that if such tax avoidance is deemed

legal under existing statutes, desirable amendments be recommended.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was an exchange between myself and the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], which occurred over the policy of the Russian Government in agreeing unilaterally with the Yugoslav Government for the transfer of material for the Yugoslav Army and for the giving of long-term credits to the Yugoslav Government such as we are intending to give here to Greece and Turkey. I will read that exchange from the RECORD because it concerns a cablegram to the Department of State dated June 11, 1946, a copy of which was not available on the floor at the time.

The essence of the debate was that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] unbelievably said that if such a cablegram or telegram had come into the State Department giving the fact that Russia had taken unilateral action first with one of her satellites, Yugoslavia, in 1946, he then would condemn Russia. So I am here to nail that down and have the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] publicly on this floor condemn Russia, which I think is a real gain for the American people. I will read the exchange that occurred in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7 on page 4724, referring to this cablegram:

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that this is the first I have heard of it. I cannot account for the accuracy of that report.

Mr. FULTON. The gentleman may accept it as accurate, because I will produce the cablegram to the State Department.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. However, assuming the statement to be correct, then I say that that action as well as this action should be handled through the United Nations.

Mr. FULTON. So the gentleman now disapproves the action of Russia on June 11, 1946; is that correct?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I disapprove the action of any country that takes unilateral action on any matter that involves the peace of the world.

Mr. FULTON. Including Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Including Russia, the United States, Turkey, Greece, or any other nation in the world.

Mr. FULTON. Then if I am right in my statement that we did receive such a cablegram from Yugoslavia, the gentleman condemns Russia just as he condemns the United States right here, does he not?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I do.

Mr. FULTON. That is very interesting.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I think any action should go through the United Nations when that action affects the peace of the world.

I hold in my hand from the State Department a copy of that cablegram dated June 11, 1946, received by the State Department at 3:10 p. m. on that day. It is addressed to the Secretary of State from Moscow and states among other things, and I will not read the entire cablegram:

Questions were reviewed of interest to both sides in regard to Yugoslav treaty of friendship, mutual assistance and postwar cooperation of April 11, 1945, and full agreement was achieved on all questions involving economic collaboration, trade, supply of material to Yugoslav army, and close cultural and political collaboration.

Watch particularly what Russia does with the situation right in this same area; yet you find a lot of people here complaining, among them some Republicans, that we are the first country to step outside the United Nations and take unilateral action. This is clearly wrong because the next paragraph I shall quote, shows it:

Government, U. S. S. R. agreed to supply Yugoslav army with arms, munitions, et cetera, on conditions long term credit, and also to assist in reestablishment Yugoslavia's own war industry.

I believe that ties the gentleman down. For once the gentleman from New York is siding with the American Government and is not agreeing with every action that Russia has taken. This, in my opinion, is a great advance in this Congress.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from West Virginia, my colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. KEE. Who signed that telegram?

Mr. FULTON. It is signed by "Smith" and it is also captioned "Repeated Belgrade as 29."

The cablegram designation for our State Department is No. 3953 Plain Moscow, 1834, eleventh.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Is the telegram signed by General Smith, our Ambassador to Russia?

Mr. FULTON. That is correct, by our own Ambassador.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the able gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Was there not another agreement made with the present Government of Poland?

Mr. FULTON. There are other unilateral agreements by the Soviet Government with various satellite countries. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. The Council not so many weeks ago made that charge, and in support of it quoted excerpts from newspapers in Poland and the Soviet Union.

Mr. FULTON. So that is the second action taken by Russia, unilaterally, outside the United Nations' sphere, and on the very type of subject matter that we are proposing today concerning Greece and Turkey.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Is it not true that over a period of time since VJ-day we have supplied South Ameri-

can countries with war materials, and nobody has ever complained?

Mr. FULTON. That is right.

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. There was nothing ever said about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate we have heard praise of the insurgents and the guerrillas in the hills of northern Greece and Macedonia, but the fact of the matter is that these insurgents are under the domination of the Soviet Union. We admired the courage of Benedict Arnold as long as he led the Revolutionary forces to victory, but as a traitor he was despised by America and rejected by England. The classic speeches of Demosthenes 2,300 years ago in denunciation of the aggression of Macedonia are applicable in 1947. His orations made him immortal, but his cries and warnings were in vain. He saw that the forces of aggression were threatening Greece from Macedonia and as 2,300 years ago the master of Macedonia, Alexander, invaded and destroyed Athens, and from Athens proceeded to the conquest of the world, so today Russia with her communism the master of the insurgent forces in Macedonia is threatening to engulf not only Greece, not only Turkey, but the entire world.

We have heard something about the selfish rich of Athens collaborating with the Germans, and about the tax evaders among the wealthy Greeks temporarily in the United States. Unfortunately, we have tax evaders in our own country, and unfortunately in the cities of the South and the cities of the North there are the selfish rich. I have no respect for those who put the dollar above their country, and I despise the tax evaders, whether they reside in the United States or in Greece. The purpose here is aid to Greece and Turkey. Let us keep to the main issue.

If there is one nation more than another that is sympathetic with the struggles for freedom and for liberty in countries great and small, that nation is the United States.

I shudder to think what would have been the fate of the colonists had it not been for the aid and assistance extended to them by France. I know that the forces of selfishness are ever present. When Washington and his ragged and barefoot heroes were at Valley Forge, I know that the rich Tories were in Philadelphia giving aid and comfort to the British, but I also know that another Philadelphian, Benjamin Franklin, was at that very time in France pleading for the cause of the Colonies.

The Governments of Greece and Turkey are not perfect. They have their problems. Greece has been invaded, her cities destroyed, her highways obliterated, and her industry wrecked. Reforms will not be easy; rehabilitation will be difficult.

The government in Greece is a coalition government. It represents the best that the majority could agree upon. The first lesson in democracy that pa-

triot must learn is that the majority must rule. The insurgents in northern Greece must abide by the will of the majority.

One small nation after another has been absorbed and is today under the power of Soviet Russia. If a helping and powerful hand had been extended, these nations might be free today.

While communism is marching on, other nations and other countries, especially the small nations of the world are looking to the United States for help and for assistance and for leadership. If we fail them they too may succumb to the threat of communism.

In this momentous hour, I cannot remain silent. I urge the passage of the pending bill.

THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations has its weakness; it is in process of organization and perfection. The proposed bill does not bypass the United Nations. Its representatives in Macedonia have been rebuffed. The United Nations has been prevented from aiding freedom in Greece by the refusal of the communistic forces in control in the hills of Macedonia and in the neighboring satellite countries under the dominion of Russia to cooperate. Moreover, Russia has veto power, and the veto power and policy of Russia have prevented successful conferences for peace and a successful functioning by the United Nations.

THE OBJECTIVES

I extend to say the objective of the bill is to promote peace to enable countries to work out their own destiny without infiltration or domination by any outside power. Peace is jeopardized whenever a totalitarian regime is imposed upon free peoples, either by conquest or infiltration, either by direct or indirect aggression.

During World War II the Greeks fought valiantly against the enemies of the United States and the Soviet Union. Greece was wrecked by invasion. The Greek Government has charged before the United Nations that insurgents receive supplies from neighboring countries under the dominion of Russia.

Sometimes we are prone to criticize Turkey for failing to enter World War II. The fact is that Turkey rendered invaluable assistance. She prevented Germany from not only obtaining possession of the Dardanelles, but from conquering Cairo and thus advancing through Egypt and north Africa.

On March 12, 1947, while Secretary of State George C. Marshall was doing his best to secure a successful peace in Moscow, President Truman appeared before the Senate and the House and announced that a grave situation confronted the world, and that our responsibility required us to aid Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism.

APPEASEMENT

We tried appeasement with Japan in Manchuria and China, and it failed. We tried appeasement with Mussolini in Ethiopia and with Hitler at Munich, and

appeasement failed, as appeasement always will. We have been patient with Russia. We have seen one peace conference after another fail because of Russian opposition. The program of Russia is to delay, absorb, and dominate. Russia has absorbed one country after another while delaying peace in disregard of her obligations to the United Nations. Today Bulgaria and Yugoslavia on the border of Greece are a threat to the gateways to the Orient. If Russia takes Greece and Turkey, she is fast on her way to conquer India and China.

THE ISSUE

The issue is whether freedom or communism is to obtain. The issue is whether the Americanism of the United States or the communism of the Soviet Union is to obtain in the world.

SOBER THINKING

Our way is not easy, but our duty is plain. We must be patient with Greece and Turkey as we have been with Russia. We are dealing with a government in Greece and a government in Turkey that are not perfect. We might as well admit that we have our limitations in the United States. We must display both faith and patience. We must be firm. We must not be any more satisfied with conditions that obtain in Athens than we are with conditions that obtain in some American cities. The road to freedom and to peace is always hard. Aggression must always be resisted. We have been most generous. Russia has been bluffing. It is time to call her hand. The President of the United States, Secretary Marshall, and their advisers, both Democratic and Republican, urge the passage of the pending bill. The responsibility is great. The cost will be high. We have much to lose but much more to gain. Russia must understand once and for all that appeasement is no part of our foreign policy, and that all governments, great and small, in their own way, without aggression, infiltration, or domination, must be permitted to work out their own destiny.

OBJECTIONS

It has been asserted that the funds advanced under the bill might be used in paying loans of Greece and Turkey to other governments. This objection has been fully met by the express terms of the bill.

It has been next suggested that the whole matter be referred to the United Nations. I have already answered this objection. At present the United Nations is without the power or the funds to render the aid needed. Moreover, Russia has plainly indicated that her veto power would be asserted.

Again it is urged that the program will lead to war. We have tried to make one agreement after the other with Russia. The bill does not provide for combat forces. Russia is out to get all that she can, but she does not want war. At least she does not want it now. Her plan may be for war in the future, but she does not want it now. The program is to prevent war.

FOREIGN POLICY

The United States has endeavored in every way to get along with Russia. The

proposed program is unprecedented. The time has come for the United States to say what it means and mean what it says. We now mean business. There is a point beyond which the United States will not retreat.

There is no partisanship in our foreign policy. It is supported by Republicans and Democrats alike. Republican Senators and Republican leadership cooperated with Democratic Senators and Democratic advisers in the recent Moscow Conference just as the chairman and ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other body have previously cooperated with former Secretary of State Byrnes. Previous conferences have failed because of the refusal of Russia to agree.

All nations must be able to work out their destiny free from coercion. Governments have recently had totalitarian regimes forced upon them against their will in violation of the Yalta agreement in Poland, Rumania, and Bulgaria. One small country after the other has come under the influence of the Soviet Union.

The small nations must have assistance if they are to survive. They are looking to the United States of America. It is time for action. They must have the assistance of the United States if they are to work out their own destiny.

There are two ways of life. The choice must be free. One way is based upon the will of the majority. The other is based upon the will of the minority being forcibly imposed upon the majority. One way of life is communism. The other is freedom, which is synonymous with Americanism. The tree of freedom cannot grow in the soil of communism. The seeds of totalitarianism are nurtured by misery and want. They grow in the soil of poverty and strife. They reach their maturity when hope for freedom has died. Free people in the free countries of the world look to the United States for aid in maintaining their freedom. The proposal does involve risk. It may involve war, but the best way to promote peace is to be prepared for war. If we fail to assert and maintain our leadership in the struggles for peace, we will not only jeopardize the welfare and the future of the United States, but we will endanger the peace of the world.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this measure passes without crippling amendments. The strategic and political aspects of the issue which we have been discussing here for several days are all important. In the first place, Soviet Union has a foreign policy of expansion and of spreading communism wherever and whenever possible, with the ultimate goal of world domination. The security of the United States of America is at stake. We must never lose sight of this fact. In the first place, Turkey and Greece are the outposts against the spread of communism in the Mediterranean area; in fact, the military aspects of this measure are more significant in many ways than the relief aspects as far as the security of the United States is concerned.

What will happen if we do not extend aid to Greece and what will happen if

we do not extend aid to Turkey and protect the strategic Dardanelles? In the first place, Greece will fall under the domination of the Soviet Union. Turkey will probably yield to the demands that are being made by Moscow. The whole Middle East would then be in danger.

When I was in Iran over a year ago the members of the Parliament in that country said the ultimate object of the Soviet Union is the annexation of Iran so that Russia may have access to the oil of the Persian Gulf. I have heard a great deal said about oil in connection with this issue, and some say they do not like the smell of oil. I like the smell of oil, and I will tell you why. It is necessary to our economy in peace, and it is crucial in time of war. Our automobiles run by oil, our houses are heated by oil. Oil is essential to every man, woman, and child in this modern world. If the Middle East goes, the Soviet Union will press westward, and finally the western gateway of the Mediterranean will come under the control of Moscow. The Mediterranean Sea will become a Soviet lake, and then definitely the security of the United States will become imperiled. We can either deny this aid to Greece and Turkey or we can give it. If we deny it, it means that we intend to retreat from our present position of world leadership.

I am amused to hear some say that we cannot afford this policy. Can we not afford to maintain our place of leadership? If this great country cannot do this, then it means that we must retreat, and it means that the center of political gravity will shift from the city of Washington to Moscow, an eventuality which I for one will oppose to the end. If this program is going to cost \$400,000,000 or if it costs 10 times that much to stop the march of communism in the Mediterranean area, it will, in my opinion, be money well invested.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman please tell us how the appropriation of \$400,000,000 will stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. Well, sir, this is the first step, and if it requires more money, I, for one, am willing to vote it.

Nobody can predict with accuracy the future. No person possesses omniscience, but certainly if \$400,000,000 cannot stop communism in the Mediterranean, let us appropriate enough money to do this job. Let us call the bluff of the Soviet Union and we will soon find out whether or not Mr. Stalin wants to fight. I believe he will stop short of that point where the United States of America and Great Britain are willing to take a stand.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In other words, we are on our way, but we do not know where we are going.

Mr. MERROW. Do you know what the future is going to be in 2 or 10 years from now?

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERROW. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Again, I ask the gentleman a question which I asked a week or so ago. If \$400,000,000 or 10 times that

amount falls to stop it, then does the gentleman advocate going to war in order to stop communism?

Mr. MERROW. I will say to the gentleman if that becomes necessary to protect the United States we probably will go to war. We did not want to do anything when Mr. Hitler took the Rhineland and walked all over Europe, but finally we sent millions of our boys to Europe and spent billions of dollars. Let us not forget recent history. Firm and resolute action before Nazi Germany occupied the Rhineland in 1936 or before the many other annexations of territory by Germany would have, in my opinion, avoided the Second World War.

Mr. BREHM. Then, why not save the \$400,000,000 and go to war right now and get the thing over with?

Mr. MERROW. Are you willing to do that?

Mr. BREHM. I would be willing to do that if it is to be our policy to stop communism—let us stop it and let us quit bluffing.

Mr. MERROW. I want to call Russia's bluff immediately.

The CHAIRMAN. In view of the large number of Members who want to speak, the Chair desires to state the policy that the Chair will try to follow in recognizing Members. Inasmuch as the Chair does not know whether Members intend to speak for or against the bill, the Chair will follow the principle of alternating between the majority side and the minority side.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, there is now pending a committee amendment to which, I believe, there is no opposition. Pro forma amendments to strike out the last word could well be deferred until the committee amendment is acted upon. Would it be in order to dispose of the committee amendment and then proceed with the pro forma amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. If it is the will of the Committee, the Chair will put the question on the first committee amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, if that is done, will it in any way prevent the Members from speaking for 5 minutes in discussing this bill under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that is hardly a parliamentary inquiry, but will answer the gentleman by saying that the matter of recognition of Members to speak will proceed on the basis of Members being recognized if they seek recognition. Beyond that, it will be the policy of the Chair, or at least the policy of the Member now occupying the chair, to alternate recognition between the majority and minority sides.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, all I am interested in is that the Members will not be deprived of speaking on this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the control of the Committee and not in the control of the Chair.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent in order that the Committee may have clearly in mind what we are voting on that the Clerk may read the committee amendment again.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: Page 2, line 5, after the word "paragraph", insert the following: "Provided, however, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: On page 2, line 15, strike out the word "and."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment on page 2, line 20: Strike out the word "countries", and insert "countries; and

"(5) by incurring and defraying necessary expenses, including administrative expenses and expenses for compensation of personnel, in connection with the carrying out of the provisions of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is on the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: Insert after (4) (A) after the word "information", page 2, line 19: "Except atomic weapons, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information relating to atomic energy or any of the foregoing other than as may be permitted in any general international agreement."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, section 1 of this bill describes in broad and essentially unlimited categories the kinds of assistance which the President of the United States is authorized to give to the Governments of Greece and Turkey. If you will turn to section 3 (c), line 6 through line 12, to 3 (d), you will see that we are not talking about International Harvester machines. Since there are no limitations on the types of weapons or information which may be transferred, I call your attention to the fact that the President is thereby, in his discretion, empowered to furnish atomic bombs, fissionable material, atomic source materials or information concerning any of the foregoing to either Greece or Turkey or both.

In pointing this out, I need not emphasize that no reflection of any kind on the President or on his purposes is intended. On the contrary, I believe the President himself has the right to ask Congress to be meticulously precise as to its wishes in this matter. The authorization to give weapons must be at least as definite as an appropriation bill. Since the House is not in the habit of giving funds without specifying both the exact amounts

and the purposes for which each amount is to be used, there is no justification for vagueness or carelessness in saying whether or not Congress intends to authorize the President to give atomic bombs or top secret information to the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

Nor can we escape responsibility by saying, "Oh, all that has been taken care of by the Atomic Energy Act." I have been advised by most competent legal authorities that the Atomic Energy Act itself does not prohibit the President, in his constitutional role as Commander in Chief, from transferring, as he may deem essential to the national defense, such weapons, substances, or information to any foreign country.

It is frightening to think that this bill, as now written, authorized the transfer to two such governments as those of Greece and Turkey, weapons, materials and information incorporating what Congress has repeatedly and excitedly declared to be the most vital element in the bastion of our security.

If there were a bill before you to give atomic bombs to Britain, I believe you would reject it out of hand. Surely materials and information which cannot be shared even with Britain and Canada—who participated in and contributed to all phases of our atomic energy development and therefore have a claim to such fruits, apart from the fact that they really know our secrets anyway—must not be entrusted to Balkan governments which are neither, to say the least, stable nor dependable.

Months were spent in determining whether the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission had sufficiently demonstrated his loyalty to our form of government, whether he sufficiently understood the principles of democracy, to make him a fit person to guard our bombs and our knowledge. We have not spent 5 minutes inquiring into the beliefs of King Paul of Greece to whom, under this bill, the President would have the authority to hand over anything or everything related to atomic energy.

Of course, the President may be relied upon to do nothing which would, in his opinion, jeopardize the common defense. Yet he should be instructed and backed up by a clear statement from Congress covering the point. For the subject of atomic bombs has been injected both in the hearings of this bill and in the debate on the floor.

On this issue, therefore, I offer an amendment which in no way impairs the authority of the President to furnish assistance except that it prohibits the transfer to Greece and Turkey of atomic weapons, fissionable materials—the main ingredient of the bombs, source materials from which these ingredients are derived and information relating to any of the foregoing or to the production of atomic energy so long as such information is held in secrecy classification by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the gentlewoman from California on the drawing of her amendment. It is well drawn, but it puts us in a peculiar quandary when it comes to deciding how to

vote on it. It might well be called a Henry Wallace amendment because it is one of those amendments which if you vote against it means you might want to send atomic bombs over there, but if you vote for it you as much as say you do not trust the President of the United States because he might send them over unless he is restrained.

As for myself I wish to say directly that while I am a Republican I have full faith and confidence in the Government of the United States of America and I have full faith and confidence in the man who is the President of the United States of America, who represents me as well as everyone here in this room, Harry Truman.

Let us simply put this amendment on the basis of confidence. If Henry Wallace has no confidence in Harry Truman and the Government of the United States, maybe some of us do. If therefore you wish to vote a lack of confidence in the President's exercising his emergency powers that still remain to him, then vote to make a certain area of the world consisting of Greece and Turkey to be under a limitation of our power and our foreign policy. Our power and foreign policy are based not only on the population here but on our strength.

We in the United States are trying to get an agreement internationally over the control of atomic energy and its use, and for the control of atomic weapons. We should not have any restraint on us when we go in and deal openly and broadly before the United Nations for such an agreement. I hope you will not tie the hands of the American Government which represents you by any such amendment, and I hope you will not throw a cloud on the President by implying that he might use such a thing unless we do something to control him and tie his hands.

Further than that, if you add this limitation, we lawyers of the House know that when you start outlining things that you will not send, it means that you will send everything else. Under this reasoning it means that you would send all the supersonics, all the jet planes, all our long-range guns, it even means that you would go into chemical warfare and send over disease germs to spread over countries. I do not want to be taken as saying that I agree to that.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I concur absolutely in the argument made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. It is not a question of who is President. If we had anyone else as President I would thoroughly agree with the gentleman and his argument.

Mr. FULTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. We have complete confidence in the President so far as matters concerning foreign affairs are concerned and the exercise of judgment in those matters. I am sorry that the distinguished gentleman from California has offered the amendment. I join with the gentleman in his able

argument and strongly urge that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina, my distinguished colleague on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. RICHARDS. Is it not a fact also that the atomic-energy law prohibits this Government from giving any information in regard to atomic energy to a foreign power without authority from the Congress?

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly correct, and this amendment again tends to cast a doubt upon Mr. Lillenthal and the Atomic Energy Commission now handling the matter in secret for this Government.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. If this bill is passed, then adoption of the pending amendment would merely be giving encouragement to Communist Russia to continue her aggression and her undermining of the United States of America?

Mr. FULTON. That is right. It contains, in essence, the same principle as the old Neutrality Act. We were going to make ourselves impotent and powerless in certain parts, which would let the forces we are trying to stop operate freely.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I would like to correct the gentleman from Pennsylvania, for whom I have such very great regard.

Mr. FULTON. That is returned.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The President as Commander in Chief is permitted under the Constitution in the defense of our country and would be permitted to send atomic energy or information about atomic bombs. As I said before, this is not a reflection on the President.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. This, of course, is no reflection upon the President.

Mr. FULTON. Why is it not a reflection upon him?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The question of atomic bombs has been interjected into the hearings and into the debate on the floor of the House. This bill is being passed in the hope that it will aid our program for peace, and it should not be passed with the idea abroad that this is an atomic-bomb bill.

Mr. FULTON. May I answer the gentleman from California? If this is no reflection upon the President of the United States, she then infers that the President of the United States would not send atomic bombs anyhow in his own

discretion. If he would not send them anyhow, then the particular amendment becomes useless.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not at all.

Mr. FULTON. Because then it is a mere, idle gesture, and this bill is no idle gesture. If, on the other hand, it might be construed either here or abroad to be a condemnation or a tying of the hands of the President of the United States, the amendment should be voted down. So the gentleman is in a dilemma and must choose whether her amendment is merely useless or a lack of confidence in the President.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman spoke about following the President. I wonder if he recalls a former President on one occasion telling the Congress that he had more information on foreign affairs and knew more about foreign affairs than the Congress did, and that the Congress should leave the question to him and he would keep us out of war. Shortly thereafter we found ourselves in war. Does the gentleman remember that?

Mr. FULTON. I do, and may I make a short answer on that. It will be recalled that the President of the United States under the Constitution of our Government is given full and free power over our foreign policy. We in Congress can consult, advise, and implement his foreign policy, but whoever he is, I am going to take his judgment. I take the judgment of the Congress on declaring war. Of course, the Congress and not the President declares war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be a good amendment.

Now, the gentleman just suggested that he had full faith and confidence in the President, and I will say to him that I believe he does not have any more faith than I have in the President, generally speaking, but I believe he is just a little bit in error, because the committee itself put a provision in the bill indicating that they wanted some safeguards on what the President could do. I believe one Member speaking yesterday called attention to this fact, and in the bill itself the committee put in this provision:

Provided, however, That no civilian personnel shall be assigned to Greece or Turkey to administer the purposes of this act until such personnel has been approved by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The committee itself wanted a safeguard in there, and to say they have full faith and confidence, that the President may have just any free hand to do what he wants to do, I believe, is begging the question just a little bit.

Now, I can see nothing wrong in that because I am telling you that in the action we propose to take today—and I oppose this bill in its essence—we are scaring the people of the world to death,

and you can say all you want to. We are scaring the people about this matter.

Somebody said communism is on the march in Europe. I say that communism is on the retreat in Europe, and it is; and as the world begins to recover, it will retreat more. What about Norway, Denmark, Sweden, Belgium, and Switzerland? You hear nothing about communism in those countries. Why? Because the leaders there are evidently giving their people good government, and communism grows and spreads where there is squalor, where there is degradation, where there is confusion; and wherever you find democracy and good government, communism cannot grow.

Gentlemen, when we give good government to our people communism will not grow here. You cannot destroy a false political philosophy or a false religion by bullets. It is impossible. It is like a ghost. You cannot shoot a ghost, because it has no tangibility. There is nothing corporeal about it. You cannot hit a ghost, you cannot see it. It is intangible, and you cannot kill the things that are in the minds of people by bullets and force. We can and we will stop Russia or any nation, or any group of nations, that might come against us by force. We will do it. But we cannot stop communism by force. We will merely spread it by such use. The way to defeat an erroneous philosophy is to give those who accept it a true one—a better one to take its place.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman has stated that communism is on the decline in Russia and other countries that he named.

Mr. MORRIS. I beg your pardon. I did not say in Russia. I said in Europe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Well, where in Europe?

Mr. MORRIS. All right, where in Europe? Did you not know and does not every sensible person know that—

Mr. ABERNETHY. I said where?

Mr. MORRIS. Just a moment. The gentleman asked me. Let me answer it. Did you not know, and does not every sensible person know, that when we helped Russia defeat Germany that we were of necessity giving some impetus to communism? Every sensible person knows what happened. And just as soon as we did that, and Germany was defeated, communism took a big impetus temporarily. I say to you there is less communism in Europe than there was immediately following the war, and everybody knows it that has any judgment about the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I was very much impressed by the gentleman's philosophy that bullets have no effectiveness in stopping ideas. I just wondered what a glorious thing it would be if the gentleman would deliver that speech on the floor of the Legislature in Oklahoma City, in view of what happened on yesterday.

Mr. MORRIS. The gentleman may have a point there, but that is a little bit too direct an action for us to take at this time, I believe.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As I interpreted the gentleman's answer to my question a moment ago, he would say, then, that it was a calamity that we defeated Germany?

Mr. MORRIS. No; I did not say that, but those who are on the other side have been implying that all the time. That is just what they have been implying. Those who are supporting this bill have been leaving that implication all the time. They seem to be suggesting that we created a worse Frankenstein than we had before.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORRIS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. After the gentleman makes that speech down in Oklahoma City, will he go up into South Dakota and make it there?

Mr. MORRIS. Yes, if the occasion arises I will make it there, too.

Let me leave this final thought: For something like a hundred years, as I recall it, the best brains and the best minds and the best hearts and the best people in Europe said that Christianity and Mohammedanism could not live in the same world. They had about five or six wars, and they, those of the Christian faith, made crusades to the Holy Land to rescue the Holy Land from the so-called infidels, the Mohammedans, and they fought and killed each other, and each side became just as barbaric as the other, as people generally do in war, but they finally decided that they could both live in the same world, and so can we if we will just keep our feet on the ground and not lose our heads.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FULTON] said a while ago that this bill is no gesture. The bill states in its title that it is to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey and continues, in subsection 1, "By rendering financial aid in the form of loans, credits, grants, or otherwise." Every Member of Congress knows that this is not a loan nor credit, but it is a gift of \$400,000,000. We were told to go to the aid—I say aid—of Greece and Turkey, but from listening to the debate every Member here and all the people of this country ought to realize this is for no other purpose than to build up an army in Greece and Turkey and to give them everything that is possible in the way of aid and assistance in fighting anyone who wants to take the Dardanelles. It is

a war measure. That is the meat in the coconut. It is also for the purpose of protecting the oil interests in the East. These are the only two things for which this bill is intended, and the American public should know it by this time.

A WAR BILL

If you want to go to war again pass this legislation. I do not want to go to war, and I do not want America to go to war. I am opposed to the bill in its present form. I say to you it is a war bill in a camouflaged style.

It was only last week that we on the Committee on Rules discovered it after the Committee on Foreign Affairs came in and gave us that information.

What does this bill do? It provides for this \$400,000,000 which should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations to see whether we have \$400,000,000 for this purpose—for armament; build up our own armed forces. Furthermore, this bill should have been reported to the Committee on Armed Forces of the Congress rather than to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It never should have come here from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. They administer tariffs, armed forces, and agriculture.

Let us analyze this a little. We have been here for the last few weeks with the Committee on Appropriations trying to cut down the expenses of Government. We cut out from the Department of Interior appropriations some \$150,000,000 that they wanted to use for reclamation and for the parks of this country and for fish hatcheries and other things that the American people want. But, no, we would not give them that. Here we are today, however, asking for \$400,000,000 to be given to the President of the United States to go over to Turkey and Greece and build up a great army for Greece and Turkey to fight some other foreign country. Oh, call it an indirect war bill and you name it correctly.

Gentlemen, as sure as you are knee high to a grasshopper, let me tell you that I believe that army we are building up over there is just as liable to be used against us as it is to be used against Russia. I am afraid of it, and I do not want any part of it. If you are after Russia, say so, and stop fooling the American people. You are not fooling Russia.

You may think you are going over there now and start in on a policy that this country never thought or dreamed of a few years ago, to build up armies in those two countries, but how soon are we going to be asked to build them up in every other country in the world. Why, it is the most ridiculous and preposterous idea that I have ever heard proposed. Thank God it is not a party measure, because if my party—the Republican Party—were proposing a thing like this I would think they were screwy. This can be named the Truman bill.

This country is now in debt to the extent of \$257,720,000,000 as of May 5. That is the greatest debt that any country on the face of the earth ever dreamed that they would owe. Four hundred million dollars may mean \$40,000,000,000 before you get through with it. Forty

billion dollars, added to the \$257,000,000,000, is enough to wreck this country financially. If you carry this country of ours down financially you will wreck it. A nation that is not financially strong is weak.

I am telling you Members that there is nobody in this Chamber who knows what \$400,000,000 is. You have been so used to squandering the money of the taxpayers of this country that you are just simply cockeyed. You do not know what \$400,000,000 is in volume. I want to tell you that you ought to get down to a little bit of arithmetic. Ten cents make a dime and 10 dimes make a dollar. Let us get back to the old fundamental principles that we were taught when we went to school and which we understand. Let us get a little common sense. Let us return this bill back to the committee and do something different than what we are trying to do here. You are taking America into a third world war. You know it; so do I. Let the American people in on it, and see what they think about it. America wants no more war in Europe. We had enough of that. No. 1 under Wilson, No. 2 under Roosevelt, No. 3 now under Truman. It is time to stop it. Do it now. Vote this bill down.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. I hope we will be able to consider it on its merits and on the basis of how it affects the legislation we are considering. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania said, it might be difficult to vote against an amendment which indicates that it is to protect the atomic secrets, but is that what this amendment proposes to do?

As you know, the Atomic Energy Control Act was handled by the Committee on Military Affairs of the House. We spent many weeks on it. It is a very complicated measure and one that received very careful consideration. Under the existing law, all matters relating to fissionable material and atomic energy are placed in the custody of the Atomic Energy Commission. That Commission is prohibited by existing law from disclosing to a foreign nation the secrets with reference to atomic energy until such time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, shall find that all of the secrets, and our interest in them, are fully protected.

The gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] argues that that does not control the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. Perhaps that is true, but it is equally true that we cannot in this bill control the powers of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief. His powers as Commander in Chief come to him under the Constitution. We cannot in this legislation restrict or abridge the powers which the President has.

I think the danger in this lies in the fact that, under the well-known and generally understood rule of statutory construction—the expression that one excludes all others—if we now adopt an amendment to this bill which would provide that fissionable material and atomic-energy information shall not be delivered to Greece and Turkey, the logical statu-

tory construction is it may be delivered to every other nation in the world. So, in order to avoid a very highly probable construction that the adoption of this amendment would exclude Greece and Turkey from receiving atomic information and permit every other nation in the world to receive that information, I think it is highly important that the amendment be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, as I have listened to practically all phases of this debate, I think this bill could very appropriately be called a bill to give the Members of Congress an opportunity to crawl on the anti-Communist bandwagon. This bill, stripped of all of its artificiality, is nothing more nor less than subterfuge of the lowest rank. It makes my stomach turn to have Members of Congress rise in the well of the House and speak of this bill as a protector of human rights and liberties. The same individuals who are such loud proponents of this bill are the same individuals who accepted the crimes of Yalta, Potsdam, and Teheran with silence. The matter of freedom and liberty did not concern them then. So let us reason this thing out, concretely and specifically. Let me ask you this simple, profound question: If Greece, which is now involved in nothing more than a family quarrel, civil war—if Greece were located in South America, would we be here today voting an aid bill for Greece? Of course we would not. Their freedom and liberty then would not be of concern to the Members of this Congress.

Let us take the case of Turkey. Suppose Turkey were located in Africa instead of where it is, do you suppose for 1 minute we would be here passing an authorization bill to help the people of Turkey? Of course not. How in the name of common sense, then, can anyone talk about freedom and liberty and talk about Turkey in the same breath? Has anyone here ever heard of the philosophy of government that is exemplified by the Turks ever being on the side of the United States of America in the entire history of the existence of their country or our country?

I remember when I was a little boy, in 1915, how I left the farm on behalf of my father and we went from one farm to another and I was collecting dimes and pennies and nickels and dollars for the relief of the starving Armenians. That was in 1915 when the Turks massacred and slaughtered in cold blood, 2,000,000 Armenian people. Their only solution of the Armenian problem was to slaughter the Armenians. Never have they been a democracy. Never have they fought on the side of democracy. And here you are going to pass a bill to aid the Turks in order to defend freedom and liberty. Stripped of all of its artificiality, as I said in the beginning, many Members of Congress and many leaders in the United States of America and our State Department are on the hot seat. They went over to Yalta and Potsdam and Teheran and they appeased. They

handed over Finland and Lithuania and Latvia and Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Albania to the Communists. Do I hear the hearts of any of those men who are interested in freedom and liberty for the Turks and the Greeks, do I hear their hearts bleed over the enslavement of those people that our country delivered to the hands of the Communists?

Do I see hearts bleeding about freedom and liberty for those countries? Not once do I see it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'KONSKI. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Does the gentleman agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that communism is playing out in those countries?

Mr. O'KONSKI. Well, yes. I will read you the last axiom from the Communist manifesto. You are not going to stop communism or ban communism through any such stupid bill as this. You have got to do something else to stop it. Listen to this. This is an axiom from the Communist manifesto:

Communism will be vigorous and united only as long as it is feeding on the properties of others. When the Communist comes to the place where it can no longer feed on the "host," it must feed on itself and die.

If it had not been for the United States of America dishing out \$2,000,000,000 since the war ended to finance communism in Europe, you would not have the threat of communism in Greece and Turkey today; you would not have it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, certainly there is no one who has been more disappointed, and I might say disgusted, with Russia's disinclination until a few days ago to indulge in discussion of a final settlement of lend-lease matters than I have; in fact, I have been considerably disgusted with Russia's conduct since the end of the war generally, as most of you have. There has, however, been a misapprehension about that lend-lease matter. I intended to try to clear it up yesterday, but when I came here and saw the long list of requests for time that the ranking minority member had, including requests from opponents as well as proponents of the bill, I did not even mention it to him.

It will be recalled, particularly by the members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, that in the original lend-lease agreements there was nothing said about time or amount of payment. That was all left to a general settlement after the war. The time came, however, when we could foresee the end of the war and realized that when it came there would doubtless be in the lend-lease pipe line many heavy-industry articles which, though valuable indeed for war purposes if they reached the recipient countries during the war, would be equally valuable to their economy after the war. Under section 3 (c) of the Lend-Lease Act, therefore, the United States entered into

agreements with all lend-lease recipient countries, including Russia, to the effect that as to whatever was in the pipe line when the end of the war came the recipient country could either cancel her orders therefor or tell us to conclude the manufacture of the material and agree to pay for it, generally over a 30-year period and in the case of Russia at 2½ percent interest. In other words, it was very much to the advantage of the United States to enter into those agreements.

When the end of the war came in the case of Russia there was in the pipe lines considerably more than \$250,000,000 worth of goods. Russia canceled the orders for much of it and told us as to the \$250,000,000: "We would like for you to continue the manufacture of those goods and we will pay you in 30 years for them 100 percent with 2½ percent interest." We agreed to that. Two hundred and thirty-three million dollars of this \$250,000,000 had been shipped to Russia before discontinuance of shipments at the end of December, leaving \$17,000,000 only. Now as to that \$17,000,000, some on the floor have labored under the misapprehension that it is entirely oil refining machinery. Some of it is oil refining machinery; some of it is railroad equipment for Russia's wide-gauge railroads. It was all built to Russia's specifications and would not be worth anything to us except for junk. Now, as to the oil refining machinery there are a number of parts for oil plants in this \$17,000,000. The big bulk of the plants have already been shipped. If you ask why there are parts remaining, I call attention not only to the difficulties of transportation recently but I also call attention to the cars you see running around Washington with wooden bumpers and I ask, What good to us would those wooden bumpers be? What good to us would be parts of oil gages or of oil refining plants which we could do nothing with but junk if we did not send them to Russia? Not only is it a solemn contract that we entered into but it is a solemn contract for the best interests of this country which has been fulfilled 93.2 percent. I do not believe my colleagues, with that knowledge of the situation, will entertain any objection to our country carrying out its agreement with Russia, whether we like its form of government, whether we wish that form of government to spread out over the United States or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment close in 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending Douglas amendment close in 30 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last six words.

Mr. Chairman, let me indulge upon the committee in a bit of ancient history. Many centuries ago Greece was the cradle of democracy. I believe that over the whole period of the history of humanity Greece has emerged as the only genuine democracy known to the world.

You will recall when any great questions were being decided by the ancient Greek legislature the populace would gather ostracons on the beaches before Athens and cast them on the various issues. The pile of ostracons which was the largest decided the question. The lawmakers were then directed by the people to vote as they had expressed themselves and as the people wanted them to.

That was purer democracy than we have today, for no representative in this House can be so certain of the feelings of his constituents as were the Greeks of old. The land which gave us our concept of government ought to receive our help when her own freedom is threatened.

Greece today—and I think I speak with all accuracy—is in jeopardy. The cradle of democracy is being overturned by forces in the Old World with which Americanism is at odds. I say the time has come when the American Nation must take a stand in the interest of downtrodden peoples like the Greeks.

A century and a half have passed since those Barbary pirates swept the Mediterranean clear of American seamen. You will also remember the inspiring tales recorded that our leaders of that time raised up and cried, "Millions for defense but not one cent for tribute."

Today, Mr. Chairman, I say that the issue is again presenting itself. When a decade ago the hosts of Adolf Hitler swarmed over Europe and crushed innocent and helpless peoples under their heels, the American National rallied, and we joined forces against the Nazi oppressors and wiped them off the face of the earth. Now, it is obvious that there are other "isms" and other oppressors raising their gargantuan heads, their ugly visages, and threatening the peace of the world and the future of our generation. The time has come again for us to take a definite stand. It is our duty to protect the underprivileged and the unfortunate members of the human race. They, too, no matter how small, no matter how humble, must be able to assert themselves in the great family of nations so that freedom, liberty, and equality will be perpetuated throughout the entire world.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. I am very glad to hear the gentleman say that we should take a definite stand. I want to ask this: In the gentleman's opinion, if Greece comes under the control of Moscow, will that not make Russia a Mediterranean

power and imperil the security of the United States?

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. I can answer that in this way: That America has never retreated. We have never surrendered our position in international affairs, and I do not think that now is the time to begin. I think that the only recourse we have is to see that the seven seas and the lands all over the globe are made as free as possible. It is our bounden duty and our responsibility to see that the freedom the Constitution of the United States personifies and guarantees should be preserved, not only here but wherever the forces of oppression have raised their heads.

I say that the question is here before us. We have debated at great length on this question and it is time we come to a decision on it. I hope that we decide wisely and that we will be able to chart a course of action which will preserve representative government and freedom throughout the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last seven words.

Mr. Chairman, in common with a lot of other Members of this House I spent about 4 years in the Army. One of the discouraging things is that many of these young fellows have risen here in the last 2 days and spoken about their disillusionment that now that we have won the war we are facing another series of disillusionments. But that is one of those things that cannot be helped. When you get rid of one tyrant, one dictator, if another one raises his head that issue has to be met head-on.

In common with a lot of these same fellows who have spoken here who have served overseas, I was overseas, in Belgium, France, England, Luxemburg, and Germany, for 2 years. The only difference between my situation and theirs, I expect, is that due to the type of work in which I was engaged I had a chance to go into an average of 15 or 20 French, Belgian, and Luxemburg homes each day. Some days I would go into the home of a baron or a count, and the next day I would be in the home of a peasant who was wearing wooden shoes. Having the curiosity I have, I studied and tried to find out everything I could about the very thing we are debating here today. After having watched the way the Communists work in France, Belgium, and the other countries over there, I say to you that we all know the same pattern and techniques of infiltration will be followed and is being followed in Greece and in Turkey, and it is being followed in this country. To those who are not afraid of the threat of communism which is facing this country I say this: It has been mentioned here that the countries that do not want communism are not having it. They mention Belgium, Denmark, and other countries. Those countries are not in the same position that the war-devastated countries are such as Greece, Italy, and part of France, because when the Germans retreated, as any soldier will tell you, although Belgium, Denmark, and those

places suffered through the occupation, the Germans did not take their livestock away, they did not tear up the railroads, they did not leave the forces there that make for communism such as we have in Greece, Italy, and other Balkan countries.

Some Members have raised the question here of the cost of this policy. When this subject was recently mentioned by one Member of this House another Member said, "Thank God no bombs fell on this country." One gentleman over here, thinking he was making a wise remark, stated "that a bombshell fell on the Treasury of the United States to the tune of \$400,000,000." When you start talking like that, do not think for one minute that a bombshell did not fall in the hearts of thousands of mothers and fathers, wives and sweethearts in this country when they got those terse messages from the War Department which said that their sons or their husbands were killed in action. We cannot think in terms of dollars in this matter.

I am going to support this bill, I do not care whether it costs \$400,000,000 or \$4,000,000,000, as long as it will stop the mad rush of communism that is sweeping over Europe, the Middle East, and is making inroads in this country. We should spend any amount of dollars that is needed to stop this insidious thing. I think this business of dollars and cents is one of the most false arguments that can be propounded here on the floor, because if you have more incidents in this country such as went on out here at Western High School, in Washington, D. C., the day before yesterday—and God knows how many have gone on in this country that we do not know about because other students have not been sufficiently trained to see what is happening under their very noses—we are not going to have a United States Treasury here some day, when this force of communism reaches Greece and Turkey and marches on into the Middle East and reaches Iraq and Iran and the oil fields over there. Some of the people speaking for this bill seem to be afraid to talk about oil. When the Russians get into Iran and Iraq, when they get the oil fields there, they are going to be in a position to wage war for a hundred years. It will not be like Hitler's Germany, when we landed on D-day and when Patton executed the break-through in France, when the reason we were able to go through there was that Hitler ran out of high-octane gasoline. If Communist Russia gets those oil fields, it will have all the oil it needs to wage war, and it will get them if it can go into Greece and Turkey; and it will be able to go in there in 24 hours if we do not give those countries some form of relief.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call attention to the fact that not only is the Near East in danger but if the Communists take over Greece, Italy is gone.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is right.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are millions of Americans of Italian blood who

are hoping that Italy will be saved. If the Communists go into those countries, the chances of Poland's being reclaimed will be gone for many generations. It is amazing how some people overlook the responsibility they owe to the land of birth of their forebears.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, we Americans seem to have the greatest national faculty of embarking upon a program and then placing upon our own hands manacles and handcuffs which render it impossible to carry the program through effectively. As I said here yesterday, there will be a number of restricting amendments offered on the floor, amendments which have not the intent or the purpose of rendering it possible to carry this program through to a successful conclusion, but amendments which have instead the purpose of destroying the successful application of this proposed legislation. In proposing the support of this legislation I do not do so with a bleeding heart, as was indicated broadly by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] in commenting on this bill. My heart does not bleed for the people of Greece or the people of Turkey, but my heart is very much concerned over the Red tide of aggression which is sweeping over the earth. I am deeply concerned about whether or not \$400,000,000 will do this job. But until we stop counting the cost of this program in terms of dollars and start counting the cost in human lives and freedom if we do not carry through, we shall continue our policy of shrinking back from the stark realities of life today.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Do you know of any standard by which you can measure a man's life or his leg or his arm in terms of money?

Mr. JACKSON of California. Those are abstract things, and I agree perfectly that you cannot measure those things in terms of dollars and cents. There are higher values in life—values that cannot be measured in terms of dollars and cents. Among those things are freedom and basic rights.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. The gentleman did not mean to say that the intent of the bill was to deliver the atomic bomb to Greece or Turkey, did he?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I did not make that statement, or even infer it.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. No; I thought you were speaking on the amendment, and I was led to believe that that is what you are implying.

Mr. JACKSON of California. No, indeed; that is not my intention.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does not this bill provide that we shall do whatever is necessary with no limitations?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I believe that is the intent of the bill and if that is not the intent of the bill, then we are stultifying ourselves so that we cannot hope to achieve our purpose.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. JACKSON of California. In conclusion, I can only offer the suggestion that almost every amendment that will be here offered has been considered in its entirety by the members of the committee. Very little new will be offered on the floor of this House today in the way of amendments. We have heard most of the arguments pro and con. We have heard scores of witnesses and taken hundreds of thousands of words of testimony.

Again, I suggest to the committee that if you want this program to succeed—if you want to try to make an effort here and now to stop this type of international aggression, then you support this legislation without major amendment. If you want to see it fail, if you want to see us going into this project without any chance of winning through, then you will support many stultifying amendments that will be offered from the floor.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman made the statement that all amendments that will be offered have been considered in the committee. I have an amendment which I propose to offer which was not considered by the committee.

Mr. JACKSON of California. I beg your pardon if I am in error on that point. I should say, almost all of the amendments have been considered in the committee.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACKSON of California. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS of Tennessee. Does the gentleman assume that he has thought of all of the possibilities and that he has all of the wisdom and all of the light that might come upon a question of this great importance?

Mr. JACKSON of California. No; I can assure the gentleman that was not my intention. However, I think if all the alleged wisdom on both sides of the issue was not heard by the committee it was because the other experts did not show up to be heard, because we have had more authorities on both sides of this question than I even imagined existed.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on this matter of amendments I want to suggest that I do not think the bill before us is any sacred cow nor do I think that it is the arc of the covenant and that anyone who touches it will fall over dead. I do not think that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has all of the wisdom of this House. Let us be frank about it. Our committee has heard in executive session our two ambassadors and certain military officers and representatives of the Army and Navy. I think we do have knowledge superior to many of the Members on the floor on many phases of this

matter. On the other hand, it seems to me that we have to consider amendments on their merits, to write the best piece of legislation we can. For instance, I disagree with some of my colleagues on the pending amendment. I think the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is an amendment that cannot hurt the bill, because if there is any conceivable possibility that the President of the United States would give our atomic information to Greece or Turkey, that possibility should be barred.

Remember, this bill starts out by saying, "Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law"; so that the power given in this bill amends former legislation. On the other hand, if this amendment is defeated, I cannot conceive of the President furnishing any atomic information or atomic energy information to the Greeks or to the Turks. I think the gentleman from California is going to propose shortly two amendments which I consider very, very bad. I am therefore going to oppose them when the time comes. It seems to me we have to keep our eye on what we want to do here and consider these amendments on their merits and not vote them up or down because of any preconceptions or prejudices. I urge that you give such attention as we deserve to the members of the committee who heard the testimony. Some of my colleagues differ with me on this particular amendment, but the important thing is to bear in mind the very important amendments which will be offered, which are destructive of the program, and which will be offered later. I hope that neither the proponents nor the opponents will waste their energy on amendments that are not too important one way or the other.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. HAYS. I think the gentleman has made a very fair statement regarding his position and that of the committee. From my point of view, the committee did an excellent job. I think when the Vandenberg amendment was added, about all the repair work that could be done was done. But does not the gentleman from Ohio think that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] advanced a valid argument? That is, the implication that under the amendment of the gentleman from California the information could be made available to others and not to Greece and Turkey?

Mr. VORYS. That is an argument that should be weighed. I simply want to say that on this amendment I cannot conceive of the President failing to carry out exactly what is contained in this amendment. Therefore, whether it is in the bill or not seems to me not of any great importance. On the other hand, I recognize the great wisdom of some of those who have spoken on this matter. My only plea was that we consider these amendments on their merits. I beg of the committee to give to us on the Foreign Affairs Committee, who have had greater opportunity to learn some information which cannot be of record, such consideration as we deserve. At the same time I do not want

to have the question of whether this bill goes through untouched by amendments, be the question that determines whether or not we have a sound foreign policy. That is all I had in mind.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. In view of the fact that the gentleman is of the opinion that the committee has produced a very fine bill and that the committee seemingly has a greater grasp or knowledge of this entire subject matter than most of the membership of the House, and in view of the fact that the gentleman has spoken any number of times, I wonder if the committee would not permit us, who have not had such an opportunity, to take a few minutes to express ourselves as the debate goes on.

Mr. VORYS. This is the second time I have opened my mouth in this debate, but I agree with the gentleman that all should have an opportunity to express themselves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not see how any Member can support this amendment, whether he is for this bill or against it. This measure is going to pass. If it is going to pass, then we certainly ought not to begin to appease Russia in advance.

I am the only man in either House of Congress who has stated openly that he was in favor of breaking relations with Communist Russia. Do not kid yourselves, they are already making war upon us.

I think this amendment would tie the hands of the President of the United States and give comfort, if not aid, to Russia in case of a conflict for which they are preparing.

I have been fighting this battle against communism for many years. I have taken more punishment, more abuse, than any man in either House of Congress.

This is the first time a President of the United States has come out on our side, and I am not willing to tie the hands of Harry Truman, because I know that if we get into war, if it is necessary to use the atomic bomb we will use it. Let me disillusion the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS]. If he thinks communism is on the wane in either Europe or in this country he ought to attend the hearings before the Committee on Un-American Activities. He ought to have heard the testimony of Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, the other day. He ought to have heard the testimony of Mr. Bullitt. We asked Mr. Bullitt, our former Ambassador to Russia, what would happen in the event Russia had the atomic bomb and we did not have it. He said that it would already have been dropped on the United States.

Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORRIS], that I read into

the RECORD the statement of the leader of the Communist Party who is going to speak in Washington tonight. You speak about its being on the way here, it is marching right up to your very door. I read into the RECORD where he said time and time again that they were for a world revolution overthrowing all governments and making communism the dominant power of the world, he said, they were just as sure to take you over as the world stands.

And, he said: "When that day comes it will not be a Government of the United States but it will be a Soviet government and behind that government will stand the Red army to enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Do not deceive yourselves. Let me say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that they are working all over this country, and it was no accident that this tool of Russia went to Western High School here in Washington day before yesterday and for 55 minutes poured into the ears of those children anti-American doctrines and arguments that were so shocking that the students got up and walked out.

Let me say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'KONSKI] what I said before: I have never agreed to and have never been satisfied with seeing Poland, the home of Kosciusko, turned over to the ruthless bunch of lawless brutes who are now destroying the Christian people of Poland.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman feel that there is nothing for us to worry about so far as communism is concerned in this country?

Mr. RANKIN. I was going to get to that point. I am glad the gentleman asked that question. Of course it is here, threatening the security of this country. I am going to call on the President of the United States to join us in driving communism from American soil. The President is my friend. He is a man I can talk to. He is the most human individual I have ever seen in the Presidency of the United States. But let me tell you this, he is a Christian gentleman, a deep-water Baptist, if you want to know the truth, the only Baptist that has ever been President of the United States. Oh, no. I know that you are going to say that Harding was a Baptist. I understand he was a Baptist only by marriage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, let me impress upon you that if the Communists take over this country there will be no Baptists in Missouri, there will be no Methodists in Mississippi, or Presbyterians in Iowa, there will be no Catholics in Louisiana or New York, there will be no Episcopalians in Virginia, because when the Communists take over all Christian churches will be closed. It is

written in every Russian booklet today that "religion is the opiate of the people." Communism is out to destroy Christianity and everything that is built on Christian principles.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. May I remind the gentleman of the fact that 2 weeks ago the President said we need not worry about that; it is a bugaboo here, that is all.

Mr. RANKIN. I have some doubt whether the President made that statement. May I say that the President of the United States realizes the danger that civilization is in today, and this amendment will not help him to meet that danger.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. The gentleman referred to remarks made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski] about what had happened in Poland. Is it not a fact that what happened in Poland and what is happening in the rest of eastern Europe points out the necessity for this legislation?

Mr. RANKIN. That is exactly what the Communists want to do in the United States, and they say so in every Communist convention where they know we have no one listening in.

Mr. O'Konski. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. O'Konski. Does the gentleman think that the Government of the United States of America can afford to finance those who are fighting communism, and at the same time finance those who are in favor of communism?

Mr. RANKIN. No; and I voted against aid to the ones who are fighting on the side of communism.

Mr. O'Konski. Does the gentleman know that our Treasury Department today is buying every ounce of gold that the Russian Government produces?

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. O'Konski. And we are paying them \$36 an ounce for it.

Mr. RANKIN. May I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the Christian people of Poland are looking to the Christian people of the rest of the world for protection, and they will get it through this bill a great deal quicker than they would by our placating or appeasing Communist Russia. Communism and Christianity cannot live in the same atmosphere; communism and human liberty cannot continue to exist on the same soil.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, for 5 years I have been in Congress listening to security problems presented before the Military Affairs

Committee and the Committee on the Armed Services. While I cannot add anything to what has been said on this particular problem, I think I approach it from a different viewpoint and with a different attitude than many of the speakers who have talked here today, yesterday, and the day before.

In my opinion, this is a problem in international and national security. To understand what the security situation of the world is today, I suggest that every one of you take a look at a globe and you will find that from 30 degrees north latitude, up over the Pole, is the area of the world in which we have so-called civilization. That is also the area in which all the trouble spots of the world are contained. That is the area in which all the wars of the last three or four centuries have been germinated. Due to rapid air transit we can get from one part of the world north of 30 degrees north latitude to any other in the same area in one trip. The rapid airplanes of today can go from any major point in the particular part of the world in which trouble may start to another point in the same area, and with modern weapons can destroy any city or other congested area therein.

We have a situation that in the event there is a major difference between us and a great power there is the possibility of us being attacked on any day and any hour. You know that the destructive capacity of weapons has stepped up so tremendously that we can truthfully say today that an army or an armed force has the possibility of destroying every nation in the world; in fact, modern wars come without warning, and they come to every household in the country. There is no longer any front any more. The whole nation is the battleground. Therefore, in contemplating these problems and listening to experts on all kinds, it is my considered conviction that there is only one true security system which fits the world of today. That security system is one that is based on law, one that is based on order, one that is based on a vehicle whereby the controversies of great nations can be settled in some orderly, peaceful way. In my opinion this problem before us today brings in focus the matter of trying to foster and develop the idea of peaceful settlement of controversies. If we do not find some way to handle the matter by peace, by some method of adjudication, the world, in my opinion, is doomed to destruction.

Why do I say that what we have before us today focuses that particular question? This is the reason for it: During the war, and in fact for many years before the war, but especially during the war, our leaders contemplated that when this war ended they would find some way to bind the world together, to settle their problems in some lawful, Christian way other than by mass murder, which we call war. The result was that the Allied leaders made certain agreements, and one of those agreements that we have before us today, was that a country which had been devastated, like Greece and others, should have the right to hold a free election and select the kind of government it wants. That meant

they were to have the kind of a government they wanted, irrespective of its kind.

Now, what do we have? Greece exercised that right. The record in this case shows that 85 percent of the people selected the government they now have. We may not like that type, but that was their selection. Now we find that one of the great powers, that agreed to that proposition, is by infiltration, by encouraging brigands and bands, is robbing that particular country of her right to select and have the government that she wants and which she by a free election selected. I say now is the time to find out by a firm, aggressive, frank attitude and statement whether Russia intends to comply with her agreement, and to allow Greece to have the government of her choice, or is she trying to destroy that right by creating turmoil and revolution in Greece?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Now is the time, right here and today, to find out whether Russia intends to abide by this preliminary agreement so we will know whether she will abide by the agreements we may make hereafter. She is talking about limiting armaments, doing away with the atomic bomb, and various things of that kind, indicating that she also wants a peaceful world, and if we can find out now by the action proposed in this bill, which we can, whether she will respect agreements, we will know how to talk to her and deal with her in the future.

I tell you that if Russia and America cannot get together in a solemn agreement to stop this mass murder that we call war, we are living in a very dismal world and a very gloomy outlook for our children.

I have traveled around the world. I have talked to doughboys and sailors in all parts of the world, and the one thing they told me above all others was this: "Mr. JOHNSON, you and your friends must find a way to avoid future wars, to keep faith with the eleven or twelve million men who fought this war and with our comrades that died and were wounded." We have to find some way to establish a world of peace through agreement, through peaceful methods. If we take a firm stand today, we will find a way to make an accord with Russia, as well as stop her onrush down through the Mediterranean and over the rest of the world. This is the test. Are we going to take a chance? Are we willing to sacrifice? Are we willing to pledge our honor and our money and our men that we will take a stand for liberty and for adherence to solemn agreements solemnly made, to the end that in the future our children and grandchildren may have and will have a peaceful world?

The passage of this bill will do that. It will let the world know that we are

demanding that those with whom we agreed stand by their commitments, the same as we are doing. It will give hope to the nations involved that we will protect their right to a free choice of the government under which they are to live and protect their right to sovereign integrity after they have made their choice.

It will let the world know that we hold sacred commitments to protect small countries. It will notify our Allies that every country is entitled to its autonomy and that its right to a free and independent life shall not be nullified. In other words, we want agreements to be kept and observed, be they preliminary ones or final agreements. The basis of law is that contracts are sacred. If we can establish that now, then we may move forward to the hope of a world of peace. Drifting, temporizing, evading responsibility and leadership, and doing the expedient rather than the right thing, will bring us turmoil and even disaster. If we take our stand firmly now, it will result in a show-down, and my prediction is that it will lead ultimately to accord with Russia and to peace that will be lasting.

That is why I hope this bill gets an overwhelming vote of approval.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the amendment now pending. I think it would be a serious mistake to adopt that amendment at the present time in view of the consideration we have given the matter. As we all know, the Seventy-ninth Congress passed Public Law 585, which is the law that controls the use and the handling of atomic energy and of fissionable materials, together with information of a confidential nature regarding them. That law before enactment was considered by the House Committee on Military Affairs, it was considered by a special committee of the United States Senate over a long period of time, it was considered by both the House and the Senate over a long period of time, and then it went to a committee of conference. We worked long and carefully in framing the bill, especially in framing the penal clauses of the bill. I think to amend by indirection that statute—and that is what this amendment would do—is a serious mistake.

I fully agree with my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] when he refers to the fact that on page 13 of that statute under the heading of "Control of information" there is a prohibition which we placed in the law against any information covering atomic energy being delivered to a foreign power without first obtaining the passage of a concurrent resolution from Congress. I think that alone makes this amendment repetitious and unnecessary.

But I go further, Mr. Chairman, and say this: On that same page of that act we find 14 or 15 prohibitions against the use of atomic energy and against the dissemination of information covering fissionable materials. We find that these prohibitions are couched in most careful and exact language. This Congress attempted to make the unlawful disclosure of atomic information to foreign powers one of the most serious

crimes known to the penal statute books of America. It is a crime which may be punished by death and, in the event lesser punishment is desired, he may be punished by long years of imprisonment as much as life imprisonment, and the imposition of thousands of dollars in fines.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ELSTON. Is it not a fact that the same act on page 9, section 5, subsection 7 (d) makes provision that the Commission shall not distribute any fissionable material to any foreign government?

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the gentleman for his valuable contribution. Those provisions of the law as we passed them in the last session of Congress make this amendment useless and repetitious. As I said, I think when we are dealing with the lives of people and with crimes which may be punished by death, we ought to be very careful before enacting amendments to any such a law by indirection.

I am not worried about what the President of the United States may do in this case. I am not worried about what this commission controlling atomic energy may do. I am certainly not worried about what we may do to the Communists in Russia to stop this propaganda that has been spread all over the world for the last 20 years. They say that the best way to kill a snake is by stomping it on the head. I believe that is right. That is the reason why I rise at this time against this amendment, and I hope the Committee will not adopt it.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened here with a great deal of interest during the last 7 days. I am greatly confused as to what this proposal is all about. What I would like to have made clear to me is: What is our foreign policy? What is the policy of our State Department? As I said the other day, is it to remove this communistic threat or is it to protect the oil fields of Iraq, Iran, and Arabia, or is it to protect the Dardanelles, or is it to protect Greece? Just what are we trying to do in venturing into Greece and Turkey.

We hear talk constantly about the threat of communism. Yet the other day in the Senate debate Senator Byrd said:

Out of the \$16,000,000,000 the sum of \$1,525,000,000 has been or will be given to Russia and her satellites. Again, I ask, can we nourish communism with our left hand and crush communism with our right? Our expenditures and commitments to Russia and her satellite nations since July 1, 1945, are as follows: Russia, \$203,000,000; Poland, \$463,000,000; Czechoslovakia, \$202,000,000; Finland, \$92,000,000; Hungary, \$18,000,000; Yugoslavia, \$293,000,000.

Certainly, no one will question whether Yugoslavia is a satellite of Russia.

More than 10 percent of this amount was not distributed as of March 1, 1947, but is being daily expended.

I cannot understand this talk about \$400,000,000 to remove the threat of communism in Greece, and yet we are

pitching hundreds of millions of dollars into Russia through her satellite nations.

Senator Byrd continues:

In view of the fact that our program abroad, which already amounts to nearly \$16,000,000,000 since the war, it cannot be said that we are doing nothing. We are doing all and more than can be expected today within the framework of the United Nations. We have met every obligation that has been imposed upon us by the United Nations.

And in answer to a question by a distinguished member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs about oil, he says this:

Right today, the State Department is urging Congress to approve \$17,000,000 to Russia for the purchase of machinery to develop new processes for aviation gasoline, which will result in strengthening communism, and yet at the same time the State Department requests Congress to approve \$400,000,000 to resist communistic aggression in Greece and Turkey.

Now, what is this all about anyway? I cannot understand. We dish out hundreds of millions to Russia on the one hand to assist them and hundreds of millions on the other hand to stop them. Somebody ought to clear the air as to what is our foreign policy. Where are we headed for? American people have a right to know. Is this our first step in imperialism? Is this an attempt to put a turban on Uncle Sam? As I said the other day:

It appears to be a step in the direction of imperialism. Imperialism is a policy of extending the domain or control of a nation. It is the kind of policy that this Nation has always avoided, and Uncle Sam has never yet tried to gain sovereignty over any other nation, and I do not want to see him attempt it now.

From all the talk you would think it appears to be a very critical situation, and yet the bill is for the purpose of aid to Greece. I would like to know just what it is all about, and if some member of the distinguished Foreign Affairs Committee can tell me what our foreign policy is to be, I certainly will be pleased to hear from him.

I yield back the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, many long years ago Aeschylus, the tragic poet of Greece, said: "He hears but half who hears one party only." During the course of this debate, we have certainly heard more than one party. Many members of both parties have spoken. In this debate we have heard both sides of the important proposition fully and ably discussed. This has been one of the best debates I have ever had the privilege of hearing during my membership in this House. We have had the privilege of hearing many excellent speeches. As I have listened to the debate, I have been very much impressed by the sincerity of each of the speakers. I accord sincerity to all who have spoken. During the course of the debate, however, I have been reminded of one brief sentence uttered by Paul as he stood on Mars' Hill, "Ye men of Athens, I perceive

that in all things ye are too superstitious." The distinguished gentleman who has just addressed us appears to be somewhat superstitious and rather suspicious. He still wonders about the foreign policy of our Nation. I believe that for once in the life of this Nation our foreign policy is easily understood and that above all it is now forthright and fearless. I believe that our foreign policy is clearly understood even by the man on the street. I am somewhat surprised to hear Members of Congress stand in this Chamber and express wonder and ask many questions concerning the foreign policy of our Republic. I believe that the foreign policy of our Nation is now generally known by our people.

Today is the second anniversary of victory in Europe. The great conflict which ended 2 years ago today was cruel and costly. In the air, on the land, on the sea, and under the sea, gallant men won great victories; yet today the documents of peace have not been written. In the First World War gallant men won great victories, but the fruits of victory were lost. Woodrow Wilson, our great and beloved statesman, came back from France with high hopes for world peace, only to die of a broken heart mid the ruined fruits of victories which were won on the fields of carnage and at great cost in blood and treasure. In the First World War men thought that civilization had learned the supreme lesson, but they were mistaken and millions died in vain. While it seems that we must always deal with great uncertainties, it at least appears reasonable to believe that had our Nation followed the admonition and advice of the great Wilson the world would not have been cursed with the cruel conflict which ended in Europe 2 years ago today. We are now wondering whether the fruits of the last great victory will be lost. We are wondering whether those who have been liberated from the yoke of oppression and from the cruel heels of tyranny shall again be immediately enslaved by a bloodless conquest which is sweeping across the earth. One needs only to look at a map to know and to understand what is happening in the world. Shall those who have been liberated be denied the blessings of free government and unfettered elections? Shall the Yalta agreement be a mere "scrap of paper" and a fraud on the people of the world? Shall we abandon the fight for freedom and break faith with those who have so recently died on the altars of freedom? The governing authorities of some nations even now respect only strength—they respect power and despise weakness. If we are to remain strong and powerful, we must at all times be fearlessly frank and eminently fair in our dealings with our own people and with the peoples of the world. I do not like unilateral trading and star-chamber sessions. I agree with Woodrow Wilson that the policy of our Nation should be at all times "open covenants openly arrived at." Can we study recent history and fail to know that we are still living in a world of secret covenants secretly arrived at? Certainly we are not here dealing with an important matter in secrecy. Our policy and our program

have been openly announced and loudly proclaimed. We are not engaged in unilateral trading. We are about to make a loan to nations in distress, and nothing we are about to do is incompatible with the letter or the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations. The purpose of this loan is known throughout the world, and no nation has a right to challenge us or to question our motives.

Men of great prominence and Members of this House of great influence have stated that America is embarking upon a program of imperialism. Every act in the history of our Nation belies that statement. Certainly Greece and Turkey know and understand the history and the ambitions of America. Neither the people of Greece nor of Turkey question our motives nor fear the consequences of our generosity. Both countries have asked for our help and assistance. If Greece, the very cradle of democracy, should fall, Turkey could not stand alone, and with Turkey would go Italy, and with Italy, would go Europe. If we are to deny this aid and assistance to either Greece or Turkey, we might as well strike out the enacting clause.

While there was no doubt in my mind as to this important proposition, my convictions were fortified during a recent visit to both Greece and Turkey. As you know, I was a member of the delegation of the American Congress which attended the first postwar meeting of the Interparliamentary Union which met in Cairo, Egypt, Monday, April 7. The delegation was headed by Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY and was composed of four Members of the Senate and six Members of this House, equally divided between the members of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. In returning from Cairo, the delegation had an opportunity to visit Ankara, the new capital of Turkey, and Istanbul, the ancient city of Constantinople; and in Greece we visited the ancient city of Athens. At each place we conferred with members of our own diplomatic corps, with ordinary citizens, with members of the press, and with high Government officials of both countries. We had conferences with the Foreign Minister and the Prime Minister of Turkey, and in our conferences with both officials and with members of the press, members of our delegation propounded questions in an effort to obtain, in a short space of time, as much information as possible. We stated at every conference that we were not there for the purpose of answering questions but rather for the purpose of asking questions. I do not believe that any delegation could have obtained more information in the short time at our disposal.

Easter Monday morning I was in Greece. I stood at the Acropolis in the ancient city of Athens and looked down on Mars' Hill on the very spot where Paul stood when he spoke to the men of Athens, and I was conscious of the fact that though I was standing upon the ruins of Greece I was in the land of democracy and among people who loved freedom. In addition to talking with many Greeks, with members of the press, and with diplomats, we conferred with the Foreign Minister, with the

Prime Minister, and with King Paul, and Queen Frederika. I hold no brief for any Greek who in any way collaborated with the Nazis. While I know a little something about the heritage of both King and Queen, I frankly confess that I know very little about their attitudes or action during the recent war. I do not, however, hesitate to say to this House that I believe that King Paul and Queen Frederika are both personally popular and that the Government of Greece is now generally popular. I do not hesitate to express the belief that both Turkey and Greece will fight to the last man in the defense of their territories and in the defense of the integrity of their governments. I believe that every man in our delegation, Republicans and Democrats alike, believes that the people of Turkey hate and despise communism and that the Government of Greece today is even more popular than it was at the time of the death of the late King George. The new King has a pleasing and dynamic personality and is more popular than was his deceased brother. He has at his side Queen Frederika, with whose great simplicity and sincerity all of us were impressed. They are both social-minded and have taken an active interest in the welfare of the underprivileged boys and girls of Greece. They appear to be anxious to pull their broken nation together and to lead it in the pathways of peace and progress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I believe that every member of our delegation was very favorably impressed with the attitude of every Greek official with whom we conferred. We were told by our own diplomats of a little incident which might give us an idea of the attitude of the present Queen of Greece. This incident was verified by the Queen herself who discussed it with us freely. She had been advised that the Communists were holding a meeting in some part of Greece. She insisted upon attending the meeting. She said that if they were Communists there must be some reason for it, for they would not be Communists unless they had grievances or causes, and she wanted to know the facts. When she insisted, she was told that it was not the proper thing for her to do, but she was determined to attend the meeting. She went to the meeting and gave them a chance to speak to her, and she in turn addressed them. She told them of her great interest in their problems and of how anxious she was to better their lives. When she had finished her speech was loudly applauded, and she was taken upon the shoulders of those there assembled as evidence of their approval of her attitude and conduct. This incident occurred just before she became Queen. Now both she and King Paul are in a position to vindicate themselves before the peo-

ple of Greece and before the people of the world. They both seem to realize that they now have a great opportunity to serve the people of their country; yet, they both also seem to appreciate the difficulties to be encountered and the weaknesses of their government when surrounded by the strength of other powerful nations. After all, we must confess that it takes a little courage for a frail woman to go from the home of royalty to a meeting of distressed and complaining citizens or subjects and to discuss with them their plight and their problems.

In the brief space of time allotted to me, I shall not attempt to discuss the many issues involved in this proposition. We know that it may be fraught with dangerous consequences. The future is uncharted. We must have faith, although we know that at this moment our ship of state is sailing on uncertain seas and may even come upon the rocks. I have great mental comfort and satisfaction in the knowledge of the fact that I am doing what I sincerely believe to be right in voting to grant this aid to the devastated and war-torn country of Greece and to the burdened and distressed people of Turkey. The people of Turkey might not fight communism merely because of their love for America, but I believe that they will fight to the last man for the integrity and freedom of their own nation, and I further believe that both the Turks and the Greeks will prove worthy of the confidence we are about to place in them by granting them this loan.

If our foreign policy is to stop communism, we had better stop it in the Black Sea, at the Bosphorus, in the Sea of Marmora, or at the Dardanelles, or at some place far distant from our own shores. Here we are dealing with a vital spot in this world. These helpless people will be easy prey to communism without the aid and assistance which we are here about to give them.

Our brave men fought for freedom, and to the institutions of freedom we are devoted. If we fought for freedom, are we not at least willing to try to keep men free?

Byron once wrote a poem which is an inspiration to those who have looked so recently upon the land of Greece:

The mountains look on Marathon
And Marathon looks on the sea;
And musing there an hour alone
I dream'd that Greece might still be free.
For standing on the Persians' grave
I could not deem myself a slave.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 12 words.

Mr. Chairman, in this momentous debate, so far reaching in its implications, sincere and conscientious legislators on both sides of the aisle are to be found arrayed in opposition. Here is no place for bitterness, for recriminations, for name calling—least of all, for attempt at political advantage. A great responsibility faces each one of us. We must each meet it squarely and unflinchingly.

It is true that the distinguished members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have held 17 meetings on this bill and listened to volumes of testimony, are deserving not only of our gratitude for a conscientious job well done, but also, it seems to me, to a rather unusual degree of our confidence in the conclusions at which they have arrived. With only 1 negative vote they have urged the speedy enactment of this legislation. Their searching investigation, however, does not relieve us of our duty to study and analyze this great question.

The principal objections to this measure, at least those which have troubled me the most, are these:

First, it is said that this is a step which will lead to war. If I felt for one moment that such would be the effect of my affirmative vote, I could never support this bill. One who has actually seen the unspeakable carnage and devastation of armed conflict, hates war, and loves peace with an unmatched passion. Although great uncertainty beclouds the future, no matter what our action here may be, it is my considered judgment that our extension of this aid to these two countries in our effort to thwart the disruption of their internal economy and their seizure by minority groups inspired by outside pressures, is the most important step, at the moment, which we can take looking toward international peace and stability. It must be apparent by now that plain speaking, backed up by forthright action is the only language which some of the nations with whom we deal seem to understand. A policy of appeasement, a querulous, weak-kneed attitude, will never work. Strength is what they understand and what they respect. Therefore, it seems to me, that such a demonstration of our firm resolve to assist those independent countries which stand in the way of further expansionist aggression is the mightiest blow we can today strike for peace.

Second, it is said this procedure bypasses the United Nations. This argument is made, not alone by those with ulterior motives for whom it is purely an alibi, but by many sincere critics of the program. To the extent that these opponents say that steps should have been taken before, or simultaneously with the submission of this matter to the Congress, to present it to the United Nations, I am in agreement. That step was taken after we were asked to act. How much better it would have been to have done so before. Of course, it would have been futile as it is now for two reasons: One, because the United Nations has not yet the funds nor is it yet functioning to meet such a situation as is here presented, and two, any such action as that here contemplated would be blocked by the veto of a single power.

It is exceedingly important, however, that we do nothing to undermine and everything to strengthen the United Nations. Such an organization is our only hope for a permanent and enduring peace. I have on many occasions said, and I reiterate it now, that I believe wholeheartedly in the principles of this international organization and yield to no one in my fervent desire to see it

work. It is my hope that the action which we take in Greece and Turkey will be limited to that which would have the approval of the United Nations if that organization were presently set up to function.

In this bill as originally drawn, I was greatly worried about this proposition. I am not at all sure that I could have supported the measure as originally recommended by the President. It seems to me, however, that by the amendment which is now a part of this bill, whereby the President is directed to cease the program of aid to these countries at any time when he is notified by the United Nations that the continuance of such assistance is deemed unnecessary or undesirable, as to which this country waives any right of veto, effectively takes care of any objection that the United Nations is being ignored or in any way bypassed. True, one country alone cannot, through sinister motives, prevent the continuance of this aid, but if a majority of the nations of the world, which have associated themselves together in this international organization, determine that we do not need to or should not go further, and they so notify us, we must stop. Although that is to some degree a surrender of a measure of sovereignty, in this world now so compact and so interdependent, we should not complain of this restriction on our unfettered action. This amendment completely negatives any claim that we in this country stand for unilateral, as opposed to joint and mutual action.

Third, it is contended that we cannot afford this expenditure. My answer to that is we cannot afford not to extend this aid. True, we must maintain a sound domestic economy. We are committed to reduction in the expenses of government. I have supported measures to that end. I shall continue to do so. But I cannot believe that our national economy and stability hangs by so tenuous a thread that the expenditure here contemplated will bring upon us the disaster which some have pictured. If my original thesis is correct, that this is an important step toward peace, as I devoutly pray and firmly believe it is, it is certainly peace at a modest price. Measured alone in dollars and cents, it represents an expenditure of approximately \$1 for every \$850 spent by this country winning World War II. That does not mean, of course, that we can do this thing 850 times without ruining our country, any more than we could go through another war without the same result, but these figures should serve to give us a perspective toward the problem we are now facing. No one can say with certainty that this plan will succeed, but it does seem to me far from accurate to depict this program as a fatal blow at the vital and vigorous economy of our Nation.

Fourth, it is said that we should not use our resources to bolster up or strengthen reactionary undemocratic foreign governments. I hold no brief for the regimes now in control of either Greece or Turkey. They are far from perfect. They, by no means, represent the choice of leaders or governmental

systems whom freedom-loving Americans would voluntarily select. Our representatives should insist, as I believe they have a right to do, without being charged with improper interference in the internal affairs of another nation, upon a clear demonstration that the governments of those countries are the choice of a clear majority of the people. But the reason I am for this bill is not because it helps Greece and Turkey, but because it helps the United States. It is unfortunate that the only vehicle through which this aid, extended in our own enlightened self-interest, can be accomplished, is not more to our liking, but we must operate with the tools which we have, fortified by the very substantial provisions for our protection incorporated in section 3 of this bill, requiring free access to United States observers to assure the effective utilization of our assistance, permission to representatives of the press and radio to report fully, prohibition against transfer without consent of any article or disclosure of any information to one not an agent of the government concerned, prohibition against the use of any such financial aid to make payment on any loan made by any other foreign power, and an injunction upon each government concerned that it must give full and continuous publicity as to the scope and progress of our economic assistance. These are all assurances which the governments of Greece and Turkey must give, and in default or breach of which our aid shall be withdrawn.

Finally, it is contended that this measure represents a committal of this Nation to a policy of imperialistic expansion which is contrary to and violative of American tradition. Only a tiny minority in this country voices this objection, to only an infinitesimal fraction of whom I am willing to concede sincerity of motive. This is the argument of those who see so much to condemn in the United States and so much to commend in the Soviet Union. We have no territorial ambitions. No thinking American seeks to establish an empire beyond the seas. Never in all history has any nation interested herself in the welfare of the peoples and stability of the governments of foreign areas with loftier motives or more unselfish purposes. Our only self-serving objective is the creation in this world, whose oneness daily becomes more and more apparent with dramatic clarity, of a universal condition of peace, tranquillity, and security wherein all peoples may live together in mutual friendliness, forbearance, and tolerance. To ascribe to the proponents of this legislation an aim at world domination by an imperialistic United States is a figment of wild imagination and a creature of subversive rationalization.

I have discussed and attempted to point out the weaknesses in the principal objections to this bill because they are admittedly troublesome and because any one of them, if firmly entrenched in a Member's mind, is sufficient cause to justify him in a negative vote. Again I say this is not an easy decision, but from those who oppose the program I ask a

constructive alternative. Somewhere, some time, we must check the forces of expanding aggression, the existence of which no thinking person can deny. We can do it now in Greece and Turkey, or we can do it later, at some other place; indeed, we can wait until those forces threaten our own shores. I, for one, prefer to take a position now. Not one of militancy, but of firmness and determination. In that course lies our greatest hope for peace.

By this bill we will buy time, time to put our own house in order and root out or at least subject to the pitiless glare of publicity those elements in our domestic economy and our own Government who would disrupt and destroy our way of life to substitute another, time to build a United Nations organization which can effectively function in like crises, time to establish and fortify with adequate safeguards the international control of atomic energy, time, I pray to God, for nations to become more acutely aware of the utter futility of armed struggle and the necessity, if we are to survive, for the establishment of a practical, workable, enforceable program of international disarmament.

My conviction that this measure should pass will lead me not only to vote for it but to vote against crippling amendments which would undermine the program. That is not to say that I shall support none of the amendments which may be offered. One which I intend to offer or to support, if offered by some other Member, and which I have been hopeful might have the support of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, who have so diligently and faithfully studied this problem, would limit the number of military and naval personnel in either Greece or Turkey to 100. The witnesses who appeared before the committee testified that it was contemplated to send not more than 70 to Greece and probably a lesser number to Turkey. The limitation I propose gives an adequate leeway. The adoption of such an amendment would serve to show to the world, if our protestations have not carried conviction, that there is no intention, under any circumstances, to send combat forces into these countries. We all concede, I believe, that such a policy would be fraught with perilous possibilities. We must permit no loophole whereby the military minded might, under any circumstances, take a step to involve this Nation so deeply that it could not, with honor, extricate itself short of war. We, as a Congress, must not, by indirection, delegate our responsibility in that regard.

Finally, when all is said and done, we are faced today not with a theoretical problem but with a fact. Our President has announced to the world, whether we agree with him or not, that he is asking the Congress to meet, at this time and in a specific place, a direct and definite threat to the peace and security of the world. He has stated that on the 12th day of March our policy of appeasement is at an end. For this Congress to repudiate him and the statement which has echoed around the globe, would be a declaration that we are a divided nation, would be an open invitation to further aggressive tactics and would be, in

my judgment, a devastating blow, not to the President, not to the Democratic Party, but to the position of world leadership whose mantle is now ours, and to the future peace, security, and well-being of every man, woman, and child who proudly claims this great Nation as his own.

[From the Washington Post]

ATTENTION TO REALITIES

Members of the House who are still arguing that the protection of Greek and Turkish independence should be left to the United Nations might well ponder events since the proclamation of the Truman doctrine. Secretary Marshall has asked them to bear in mind the failure of the Moscow Conference. This failure demonstrated that the Russians are betting that the drift they are inducing will wind up in a catastrophe which will expand the area of communism. Encouragement of drift is to be seen in other matters which await Russia's participation. For instance, look at what is happening to the UN's European Commission. This was set up belatedly to study European reconstruction, and got under way only after Russia's satellites, alarmed over the end of UNRRA, pushed Russia into it. It is meeting currently in Geneva. A wrangle is going on there on the perpetuation of the bodies which are the only means available for holding Europe together as an economic entity. The immediate subject of argument is the transport organization. According to the New York Times' correspondent, Russia is seeking to kill it. The inference cannot be resisted that Russia is seeking to use the European Commission, not to put Europe to work, but to prevent other people from doing so.

As we have said several times already, the United Nations has neither the finance nor the police to do what is required in the Near East. The recent report of the military staff committee of the United Nations makes for doubt, indeed, whether the UN as at present organized will ever be in such a position. It is this committee that was intended to put force at the disposal of the world organization. But a wide area of disagreement between Russia and the west is reported by the military staff committee. The Russians are revealed as not ready to contribute a contingent or a base to the United Nations on a permanent basis for the purpose of building up a unit which could be trained as a United Nations unit for police work. They object even to interchange of military information. Distrust of world organization could not be better demonstrated than in this military staff report. The United Nations is thus being hog-tied from acting as anything more than a hortatory body. In these circumstances, if we were to leave it to the United Nations to attend to the Greek and Turkish requests for aid, we should, in fact, be making the idliest of idle gestures. It would be dangerous living for this Nation to trust an organization which is not able to develop any teeth or any authority to look after our national security, for that is what is involved in the Greco-Turkish bill.

Nor can we even rely upon the United Nations to do the elementary job of finding out the facts. The Balkan committee of the United Nations has had a trying time in investigating the border situation in Greece. It is now in Geneva engaged in writing its report. In early April the Post wrote of the need to keep the border under observation, and on April 18 the Security Council authorized the Balkan committee to return a subcommittee for that purpose. Now comes the news that Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania will not work with this subcommittee. Albania refuses even to recognize it. Yet, in the face of this progressive sabotage of the United Nations, some Americans are

still taken in by Muscovite charges that, in responding to Greek and Turkish requests for economic and military aid (the pattern of which, incidentally, has been set in Russia's own pacts with her satellites), we should, in some mysterious way, be bypassing the United Nations. We hope the House in the vote on Greco-Turkish aid will have the wisdom that comes from attention to realities, and think of it as self-aid.

[From the New York Times]

A CHALLENGE TO UN

A serious challenge to the authority of the United Nations has come from three of Russia's Balkan satellites—Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Albania. These countries have served notice on the Balkans Investigating Commission, created by the Security Council to investigate violations of the Greek border, that they will refuse to work with the Commission's subsidiary group authorized by the Security Council to continue surveillance of the border until the Council can act, and will in particular bar this group from their territories, where the border violations originate. Albania, which has been playing hide-and-seek with the United Nations, says that it refuses even to recognize the subsidiary group.

The issue arose as a result of the Security Council's adoption on April 18 of an American proposal to the effect that, pending a new decision by the Council, the Investigating Commission, now drafting its report in Geneva, "shall maintain in the area concerned a subsidiary group composed of a representative of each of the members of the Commission to continue to fulfill such functions as the Commission may prescribe in accordance with its terms of reference." The Commission's terms of reference, as laid down in the Security Council's resolution of December 19, 1946, explicitly authorized it to conduct its investigation in such territory in Albania, Bulgaria, Greece, and Yugoslavia as the Commission considered necessary, and to call upon the governments, officials, and nationals of those countries for relevant information. Despite this, Yugoslavia now takes the lead in barring all further surveillance beyond the Greek frontier.

Under article 25 of the United Nations Charter all members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. The Investigating Commission has promptly referred the Balkan challenge to the Council, and the Council's decision will go far toward determining its authority.

In this incident we have another answer to those who charge that in trying to aid Greece the United States is bypassing the United Nations. The bypassing is being done elsewhere. And the clear evidence of that fact should be taken to heart by every Congressman trying to make up his mind how to vote on the Greek-Turkish aid bill now before the House.

[From the Washington Evening Star of March 27, 1947]

OVERSELLING THE UN

The language of Trygve Lie's appeal for the submission of all international problems to the United Nations "even when the most vital national interests are at stake" was somewhat ambiguous. But if he intended what his statement has been interpreted to mean—namely, that the problem of aiding Greece and Turkey should have been submitted to the UN—then he has done a disservice to President Truman's effort in behalf of those countries and, perhaps more importantly, to the United Nations itself.

Mr. Lie, Secretary General of the UN, did not mention Greece or Turkey by name. He did say, however, that "the bedrock on which the United Nations can build solidly and securely for the future" is a readiness

of members to resort to the UN and to live up to its "solemn principles and purposes."

From this language, two inferences can be drawn. One is that he was rebuking President Truman for moving directly to aid the governments of Greece and Turkey without recourse to the UN. And the other is that the UN would have been competent to deal with the problem if it had been dropped in its lap.

So far as the first point is concerned, there is not a great deal to be said except that its effect, if it has any effect, will be to hamper the effort which this Government is making to check the spread of Communist-dominated regimes into the eastern Mediterranean. If Mr. Lie believes that any useful purpose can be served by this, it can hardly be denied that he has the right to express himself. But the implication that submission of the case to the UN would have enabled that institution to "build solidly and securely for the future" is another matter.

The trouble with this is that the UN is not even remotely competent at this time to deal with an issue like that involved in the Greco-Turkish question. It has no funds for loans to either Government. It has no facilities for extending any kind of military assistance to those Governments. And, most important of all, the Russian representative on the Security Council, by the exercise of his veto, could prevent the extension of any aid, even if the UN were capable of assisting.

For Mr. Lie to ignore these plain facts, and to talk at the same time about building solidly and securely for the future, is merely to play with words, for the strong probability is that submission of the question to the UN, far from strengthening that agency, would tend to wreck it.

One of the troubles with the UN today is that it has been "oversold." Through the medium of loose statements many people have acquired a grossly exaggerated notion of the contribution to peace and security which the organization is capable of making at this time. The danger of this is that when the truth becomes generally known there will be cynical reaction in this country that will seriously undermine American support for the UN. This is something that Mr. Lie and others, who seem disposed to overplay their hands, would do well to keep in mind.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I did not spend Easter Sunday as did the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] hobnobbing with Greek Royalists. I believe his sincerity but I do know, however, that there have been various official reports concerning the very corrupt and undemocratic Government of Greece, and I do happen to know that Fredericka, the present Queen of Greece, consort of Paul, was a Nazi, a direct descendant of Kaiser Wilhelm. She is not going to change overnight, and I am not going to take my impressions about the Greek Government from royalty and others having royalty opinions in the city of Athens. He talked to officials and even the press but all of them probably held to their prejudices and bias in favor of the royal couple. I would rather go into the very heart of Greece and talk to the peasants and get their reactions as to the bribery and the corruption and the coercion that exists in the Greek Government.

But, aside from that, my inclination has been to vote for this bill, but I had grave doubts as to the wishes of my constituents. I received many conflicting reports in the form of telegrams, let-

ters, and verbal communications, and I determined to take a poll. I secured from the Board of Elections of New York City an exact list of all the voters of my district, and I sent to every election precinct or district 150 ballots. In all, I sent out 24,000 ballots to my district on which was printed the following:

I favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey. I do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

The constituent was asked to check one of the two questions, affix his signature, and address, and mail back the ballot to me. Not more than one questionnaire or ballot was sent to each family.

I have received in my office thus far almost 5,000 returns; over 20 percent. I have spoken to direct-mail advertisers, and they tell me that is a very excellent return. The result of the poll showed that my constituents oppose decidedly military and financial aid to Greece and Turkey. For every return indicating approval of such aid there are three cards indicating disapproval; in other words, my district is opposed to this loan in the ratio of 3 to 1.

It is interesting to note that in hundreds of instances the vote is in favor of financial, but not military aid. Others favored such aid provided it was channeled through and controlled by the United Nations. Hundreds wished to eliminate Turkey from the terms of the bill. Hundreds of others opposed the aid because of the autocratic governments of Turkey and Greece.

The following conclusions are inescapable:

The preponderant majority of my constituents do not favor financial and military aid to Greece and Turkey.

They would favor it if only financial aid were advanced, if it were channeled through and controlled by the United Nations, and if Greece and Turkey were truly democratic countries.

The poll was taken without any advance publicity. Pressure groups could not have exercised any undue influence because the greatest number of returns came in the first few days after mailing. The vote was consistently 3 to 1 against the loan throughout the daily count. That ratio did not vary.

I was put to considerable expense to conduct this poll. I deemed it worth while, however. My district is just as intelligent as the district of any other Member. My people are just as alert and awake. I desire to represent my people. That is my duty. Despite the preponderance of view against the bill, I tried to argue with many of my constituents, I tried to change their view but could not. They are my last court of resort. Their view must prevail against my inclination to support the administration especially when opposition is on a 3-to-1 basis.

If the imbalance had been say 1 to 1½, or even 1 to 2, I would have allowed my tendency to vote for this bill to bear the weight in favor of the aid, but I cannot buck up against a tide of 3 to 1 against that aid. Therefore, unless the amendments to be offered by the gentleman

from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] are carried, I must perforce vote against the bill.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, after the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] is disposed of, I expect to offer a series of amendments, the first amendment on removing the military provisions of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am revolted by the sham and hypocrisy of the so-called Greek-Turkish aid program. The American people feel a warm and generous sympathy for the courageous Greeks who drove the Nazi invaders from their soil and who have suffered so much both at the hands of foreign oppressors and domestic tyrants. But the administration is using those sympathies to drum up support for a program which will not help the brave Greeks so much as it will give aid and comfort to their oppressors. If the Greeks are starving—and I have no doubt they are—why is the major portion of the appropriation destined for military purposes rather than relief? If our goal is the economic rehabilitation of Greece, surely this requires a long-term and well-thought-out program, a program in which other nations as well as ourselves should participate. Instead, we propose to put weapons in the hands of the Naziphile Greek Government, to shoot down those very Greeks who were most militant in resisting the Axis forces, who endured incredible hardship while their King luxuriated in Claridge's Hotel in London. I have misgivings even about the smaller sum which is destined for relief. In the past, relief for Greece has been gobbled up by the rich men of Athens, protected by an archaic system of taxation and foreign-exchange laws which permit them to send all their wealth out of the country for safekeeping. It is for the benefit of these rich idlers that American taxpayers are being mulcted.

And what of this noble impartiality which with the same hand lavishes gifts upon Greece and upon Greece's traditional enemies the Turks, persecutors of Greek Christians as well as Jews for thousands of years? If the Turks are suffering anything, it is indigestion over the swollen profits they amassed during the war by gouging the Allies for every ton of wheat and every pound of chrome. I tell you it is absurd and odious for us to pretend that we are helping to establish democracy and prosperity in Europe when we ally ourselves with the craven and corrupt Greek monarchy, and give generous gifts to Turkish war profiteers.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Greek people are in great need. But they are not going to be helped by sending them guns and tanks. There have been too many guns and tanks in Greece already. The corrupt Greek monarchy has been maintained in power by guns and tanks—by British guns and tanks and by American lend-lease guns and tanks in the hands of the British. When the British took over in Athens they were ruthless in their determination that any opposition to the monarchy—a monarchy that served the interests of the British—should be suppressed. Greeks were forbidden to hold public meetings.

Newspapers could not be published without British permission and British censorship of their contents. A curfew was proclaimed between 7 p. m. and 7 a. m.—no Greeks were allowed on the streets of Athens between those hours.

An American in Athens in late 1944 has reported an example of just how this curfew was enforced. A little Greek vendor of odds and ends—some cigarettes, bits of wire, shoe laces, and other trifles which were very precious and rare in Nazi-pillaged Athens—had an orange crate on the corner opposite the hotel in which the UNRRA mission was billeted. A customer stopped about 5 minutes to 7 p. m. The American watched the transaction from the window of the Acropole Palace Hotel to see the bushels of drachma notes change hands. One hundred billion drachmas equaled about 1½ cents in American money. There were few one hundred billion notes and payments were made in millions, one billion, five billion and such notes. The counting of fistfuls of paper took time. The customer left with his cigarettes about 7. At 7:03 the little Greek tradesman was busy packing his stock into his orange crate when a British patrol car came by. There was no questioning. There was no arrest. The patrol turned its machine gun on this "law-violator" and riddled his body with bullets. In the spot where he had tried to make his meager living was a pool of blood and bits of flesh scattered over the pavement. This was British enforcement of "law and order" in the early stages. The repression by the British grew more widespread as time went on.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that there have already been too many American guns in the hands of the British and in the hands of the Greek monarchy imposed by the British. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the United States should have no part in bolstering up a corrupt monarchy which could not last 5 minutes in Greece without outside help. I say that if we are going to ship relief to Greece let us ship relief and not guns.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say further that if we do send relief to Greece we should see that it gets to the Greek people, and not to the royalist clique. What happened to the foodstuffs which the United States sent to Greece? What happened was that they were sold for fancy prices to the few wealthy Greeks around the King and his circle, and the people of Greece continued to die in the streets.

American members of the UNRRA mission have reported that the only place that they saw lend-lease food from the United States was at royalist cocktail parties. Chicago sausages, California sardines, American cheese were lavishly served at cocktail parties while the people of Greece wasted away from starvation.

The Greek monarchy helped to finance itself by the sale of American food at exorbitant prices. The Greek Government does not believe in taxes. To this day it raises a large part of its revenue through the sale of relief supplies—supplies for which the people of the United States have taxed themselves to give to the poor of Greece.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not send guns to Greece. I say that if we send food we should see that it gets into the hands of the people who need it and not into the hands of a corrupt monarchy.

I have heard many Members who are in favor of this speak of Greek freedom and Greek democracy. There is no democracy in Greece. The gentleman from North Carolina spoke of visiting the ruling princes of Turkey and Greece. He saw the wrong people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman made the statement that the delegation went to Athens and conferred with the wrong people. Can he think of anyone better to confer with than our own diplomatic corps who were there at the time and with the press, including representatives of the American press, and with the officers of the Greek Government and citizens of Greece? We were only there a short time. I am not attempting to speak as an authority on Greek affairs.

Mr. BENDER. Will my friend tell me how long he was in Greece?

Mr. COOLEY. We were there 2 days and nights. We conferred with these people and did not waste a minute in our effort to obtain information.

Mr. BENDER. Did the gentleman confer with any of the poor people of Greece who are starving?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; we certainly did. We spoke to representatives of the poor people. The gentleman seems to be objecting to the fact that we accepted an invitation from the King and Queen of Greece. I regret that the gentleman was not along with us because I think he would have accepted the same invitation.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, I am glad I was not because I am not given to dining and wining with royalty. I am just an ordinary citizen from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does not this projected program in effect set the United States up as the dictator of Greece?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman states a fact.

You know when we go into this business we are like the fellow who was going into the rabbit business on a very small scale. But the rabbits would not cooperate and pretty soon he was in a big business. That is exactly what we are doing here.

The gentleman from New York spoke of \$400,000,000. This is just the beginning. When Britain pulls out of India next year, we will have 400,000,000 Indians on our hands. God only knows what that policy will result in. When the French come in next year with their

hands out, and the British come in again before this year is up for more money, then we are in the same position as the fellow who wanted to go into the rabbit business on a very small scale. You cannot operate on a small scale and our economy cannot stand the impact of the cost of this.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. BUFFETT. The proponents of this program are not honest enough and do not dare to come here and tell us the whole story for they know it would be defeated. Is that not correct?

Mr. BENDER. They know that, and they would not come here and ask us at one time to provide all the money that is required.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, we have had very illuminating debate on this first amendment. I am wondering if we cannot make an arrangement to come to an end on this one amendment. I want to give everybody a chance to speak but there will be plenty of opportunity on other amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman submit a request at this time?

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that I think the debate on the amendment is over, so long as the Members know there is no stopping of debate on the section. It seems to me the Chair might put the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the pending amendment is the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED of New York. May the amendment be read?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk again reported the amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I understand the Red Cross bill is on the Speaker's desk for signature.

I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 2616, had come to no resolution thereon.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 591. An act to amend the act of January 5, 1905, to incorporate the American National Red Cross.

XCIII—304

ASSISTANCE TO GREECE AND TURKEY

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 2616, with Mr. CASE of South Dakota in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. BENDER and Mrs. DOUGLAS rose.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from California rise?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. DOUGLAS: On page 2, line 24, insert the following additional clause:

"Provided, however, That none of the aid herein authorized for Turkey shall be furnished until the President shall have advised the Congress that the United States has requested the appropriate agency of the United Nations to inquire into conditions in Turkey and to take such action, if any, as may be necessary to safeguard the national integrity of Turkey, and that the United Nations has failed within 1 year after the enactment hereof to take action which in the President's judgment is adequate for that purpose."

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, it is proposed in this bill to provide assistance to Greece and Turkey. It seems perfectly obvious that the conditions prevailing in these two countries are not the same. Greece is in the midst of civil conflict, Turkey is not.

Facts have been presented to the committee to show that Greece is in extreme need of aid. The facts show that Turkey is not in imminent economic peril or in dire need of outside assistance. Turkey at the beginning of the war had somewhere around \$45,000,000 in gold. Her total gold and foreign exchange resources today stand at \$245,000,000. Of this \$227,000,000 is in gold.

When we talk about aid to Turkey we are talking about military aid. There is no evidence that economic aid is needed in Turkey or that the Government of the United States expects to extend economic aid to her. We are falling into the ancient error, it seems to me, of preparing for war without attending the issues which create war.

The amendment which I now offer is motivated by my unshakable conviction that military assistance to Turkey is a problem for the consideration of the United Nations and not for the consideration of any single country or group of countries however unselfish and benevolent their intentions.

The Vandenberg amendment reflects our grave uneasiness and doubt in embarking upon a foreign policy of military assistance to Turkey in the absence of sufficient evidence made available to the American people or Members of Congress justifying the widely publicized conclusion that Turkey is imperiled by outside pressures.

What are the facts to buttress our position committing the Nation to so grave a step? I do not say there are no facts; I say that we have not yet learned those facts. I say, too, that the United Nations alone is in a position to make an impartial examination into all the truth of Turkey's claims and to make the facts available.

What I propose in my amendment is wholly consistent with the purposes underlying Senator VANDENBERG's amendment. It goes further, however, in that instead of saying that the United States will do so-and-so unless the United Nations at some later date says "No," my amendment says that the United States will not do so unless the United Nations fails to take action within a specified period of time. There is a vast difference between steaming ahead on our own subject to countermmanding orders from the United Nations and giving the United Nations in the first instance precisely the kind of responsibility it was set up to discharge.

I urge taking the question of Turkey to the United Nations. Let me remind you that the reason we propose giving military aid to Turkey is to help Turkey maintain her army so that she can resist outside pressures. I say we should bring the matter of outside pressures on Turkey before the Security Council, which was set up to establish and maintain the peace of the world.

Russia has no right to bring the kind of pressure against Turkey which requires Turkey to maintain an army she cannot afford. If she is doing so she should be called to account. And she should be called to account for her actions before the nations of the world.

I am not against aid to Turkey, if the reasons for aid are clearly spelled out before the world's tribunal, the United Nations.

What we are doing if we give military aid to Turkey is to say to Russia, "Here is 10 cents on the dollar, we will put down the other 90 cents if it is needed." We say further, "We are backing the national integrity of Turkey and that Russia had better not bring undue pressure upon her in the settlement of the Dardanelles question," because it is the Dardanelles we are talking about in this bill in its relation to Turkey.

Mr. Chairman, we can express our interest in the Dardanelles just as well in the Security Council of the United Nations or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as we can by giving Turkey money to maintain her army and not forfeit the moral leadership that is ours and ought to be ours in the world. We run no risk by carrying the alleged Turkish problem to the United Nations. If Russian forces rolled over the Turkish border we would be at war. The sum of \$100,000,000 which we propose to give to the Turkish Army in this bill would accomplish nothing. The Turkish Army could not stop the Russian Army.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. DOUGLAS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is my understanding correct that if the question were taken to the Security Council it must be by an unanimous vote of the Big Five?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has expired.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, answering the gentleman from Massachusetts, I say "No." Neither in the Security Council nor in the General Assembly can the discussion of any subject be barred. The only time that the veto works is when direct action must be taken by the Security Council. The United Nations forced the Russian troops to leave Iran with no more power than they have now. If the Russians rolled over the border of Turkey, I would say to the gentleman from Massachusetts we are in war.

We have an interest in the Dardanelles. I do not question that interest, but we can express that interest as well in the Security Council or in the General Assembly of the United Nations as by giving aid to the Turkish Army. We should work through the world organization which we helped create, and in which, I am convinced, lies the one hope of peace for the world. We can always do what we propose to do here if the United Nations fails to act.

My amendment provides that the President shall instruct the United States delegate to the United Nations to request the United Nations to study conditions in Turkey and to evaluate the contentions of the Turkish Government insofar as they purport to show that the national integrity of Turkey is threatened by pressures from outside sources.

No group is better qualified to judge the Turkish position and to weigh the reality underlying Turkey's alleged fears than the United Nations. For such purposes was the United Nations established and only if it discharges these functions vigorously and with the full cooperation of the United States can the world preserve the hope of lasting peace.

The amendment allows a period of 1 year during which the President of the United States is to get this train of actions under way. If within that time the United Nations acts, presumably the President will await its report before deciding on the next step. If, on the other hand, the United Nations signifies that it is unwilling or unable to accede to our request, the President upon advising Congress of the fact is thereafter at liberty, within his discretion, to furnish such military assistance to Turkey as is authorized in the bill before us.

One final word. The issue in the Turkish question is the problem of the future of the Dardanelles. At Yalta and at Teheran the United States and Great Britain solemnly pledged their assistance to the U. S. S. R. in bringing about a revision of the Montreux Convention, which gives Turkey its present stranglehold on the straits. The problem has

not been settled; not even fully considered or debated formally among the interested powers. It will not be settled—on the contrary it can only be complicated and confounded by unilateral action on our part. It can only be settled by the United Nations since it is a problem of vital concern to the peace of the world. The amendment I propose seeks this solution. Let it be arrived at by a world tribunal prepared to examine and evaluate competing claims to get at the facts and to do equity. Let the United Nations decide and let the United States be the leader in championing this course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from California has again expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 24, after paragraph 5, insert "Provided, however, That the President, notwithstanding the assistance furnished to any country hereunder, is directed to initiate proceedings, unless such proceedings have heretofore already been instituted, to bring to the attention of the Security Council or the General Assembly of the United Nations, any situation which threatens the territorial integrity or political independence of any country assisted hereunder and makes necessary the maintenance of fully mobilized forces by such country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it is the purpose of my amendment at this moment to juxtapose the choice before the committee and that is the reason this is brought up as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California. My amendment says that we shall aid Greece and Turkey now, but simultaneously with such aid the President shall take the action provided by the Charter of the United Nations in cases where a situation exists likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, and this is exactly such a situation. The gentlewoman's amendment proposes that we shall wait a year, giving the Security Council an opportunity to decide this issue before we do anything. Obviously, if we wait until that time, we will be defeating the purpose of this particular legislation.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Not wait 1 year; wait 6 months.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentlewoman's pardon.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is very necessary that the Committee understand clearly the difference between the approach the gentlewoman from California is making to this question and the approach being made by the gentleman from New York. They both seem to do the same thing, and both seem to be something that this Committee endorses and supports, and that is to bring in at the proper time and in the proper manner the United Nations to determine the

extent of these outside pressures being exerted upon the Turkish border, and to determine whether or not the United Nations is able to carry out its mandate and its authority to correct that kind of disturbance. But I believe that we should support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York as a substitute because it does provide now that we go right ahead, as we are expected to do under the present proposal, and make this relief available, and that puts a few extra teeth into the Vandenberg amendment by assuring the world that we propose to go before the United Nations and call attention to these outside pressures, and solicit the support of right-minded people throughout the world to bring those pressures to an end. It in nowise cripples the purpose of the basic legislation but it does bring the United Nations in specifically as the Vandenberg amendment would do it more generally.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. May I point out that there is a doctrine in this legislation. The legislation itself, insofar as Greece and Turkey are concerned, it has been clearly shown, is a stopgap. It is designed to stop a situation which it is said cannot be controlled in any other way. But the doctrine that is in this bill is the Vandenberg doctrine. What is that doctrine? It is that while we keep the situation in the world from deteriorating further we at the same time, though we are the greatest and most powerful nation on earth, subject ourselves to the judgments of the United Nations. We demonstrate in this way our faith in the United Nations and our will to make it the strongest force for peace among the nations. The League of Nations was wrecked because no powerful nation would accept as binding upon itself the judgments of the League. We must not repeat that mistake.

The Vandenberg amendment is a condition subsequent; in other words, it says that when the United Nations asks us to stop assisting any country because it is unnecessary or undesirable we will do so. But this amendment is a condition precedent, because we say at the same time that we go in and do something which we have to do, which there is no one else to do, we invite you, the United Nations, to consider our action, the situation which brought it about, and what can be done to deal with that situation. That is the purpose of my amendment, and I believe it is part and parcel with the Vandenberg doctrine.

May I call the attention of the Committee to the provisions of the United Charter itself which envisage this very situation. Article 2, paragraphs 3 and 4 of the United Nations Charter, read as follows:

3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered.

4. All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. We are coming to the aid of Greece and Turkey because we say there are threats to their territorial integrity or political independence. Those are exactly matters with which the Charter charges the United Nations, and therefore under this amendment we have both lines of action going forward together. We stop deterioration of the international situation which cannot be stopped now in any other fashion, and at the same time we subordinate ourselves to the judgment and activities of the United Nations by asking it to proceed in the same situation. This has already been done in Greece. The charges by Greece that her northern neighbors, Albania, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, have invaded her northern border are under investigation by a United Nations Commission. The same thing has not been done in Turkey. If the external pressures on Turkey are too subtle for detection by the United Nations, then those pressures are too subtle for detection by the United States. Therefore, the United States should agree that there are external pressures that may be considered by the United Nations, while the United States comes forward with the material means by which the condition of the countries it proposes to assist can be stopped from further deterioration now.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD of Montana. I want to compliment the gentleman on his amendment. As I understand it, what it does is to take away the curse of unilateral action and bring about a more multilateral action on the part of this country in connection, insofar as possible, with the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the gentleman. That is exactly my intention.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. But we do proceed without referring it to the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. I beg the gentleman's pardon; we refer it to the United Nations and proceed at the same time.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. In that respect, is it not a good argument from the standpoint of Russia to say that we are the aggressors?

Mr. JAVITS. No, sir, because we submit ourselves to the mandate of the United Nations. How can an aggressor submit himself to the United Nations and still be considered an aggressor?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. I understood the gentleman to say that we proceed according to

this act and at the same time we place this entire matter in the Security Council of the United Nations.

Mr. JAVITS. Or the General Assembly.

Mr. BLOOM. The Security Council, according to the Charter, is the only part of the United Nations that has a right to proceed in this manner. There must be some danger. This matter we are proceeding on now is an internal matter. It has nothing to do with an outside danger, like the border episodes that exist today in Greece. Nothing like that exists in Turkey. You cannot at the same time proceed under the legislation we have before us now and ask the Security Council of the United Nations to proceed. That is impossible, because as soon as we go to the United Nations and ask them to proceed with reference to Turkey, then we are a party to it. If we make a complaint to the United Nations that the peace and security of the world is threatened by the actions in Turkey, we are destroying everything.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes. I should like to have this cleared up.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Turkey has requested of the United States that we go in and help it at this time. If we say to the United Nations as to Turkey, "This is not a unilateral agreement at all; you take this in your Security Council and act upon it there," we are destroying everything we are trying to do for Turkey.

Mr. JAVITS. There are two difficulties in the argument just made. One is that the President of the United States came here and invoked our aid for Turkey specifically on the ground that Turkey was being submitted to such external pressures as to imperil her integrity and political independence. External pressures, as I said before in my argument, cannot be so subtle that they can be detected only by the United States and not by the United Nations.

The question is also raised as to whether the United Nations could act. The United Nations Charter itself settles that question. It draws a clear distinction between disputes to which the gentleman referred and situations. Article 34 states:

The Security Council may investigate any dispute or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security.

May I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the General Assembly may consider such a matter, for article 10 states:

The General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter or relating to the

powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter.

Also article 11, paragraph 2, states:

The General Assembly may discuss any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any Member of the United Nations.

One further very important point—in the General Assembly there is no veto power. If the United States proceeds in the General Assembly, the veto power of any great power raises no difficulty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. With reference to the external difficulties of Turkey, they are merely this: That the Turkish Government has been compelled for years to keep a large army on the border because it is threatened, not on the border by Russia, but far away from the border, and Turkey is always afraid that Russia is going to come down into Turkey. That is why she has been put to this tremendous expense to keep this large standing army on the border for years.

Now, you differentiate between the General Assembly and the Security Council. If you want to do anything at all, you cannot go into the General Assembly with this. You must go into the Security Council. If we go into the Security Council and it is at the request of the Government of the United States, we foreclose ourselves from voting in the Security Council on this measure.

Then, you will have to get the other three powers in the Security Council to vote; otherwise, you are foreclosed yourself. Therefore, Russia will come in and beat you because you have no voice in it at all in the Security Council.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with the points that the gentleman has raised. We must remember that U. S. S. R. has demanded from Turkey the right to fortify the Dardanelles jointly with Turkey. There are constant radio broadcasts into Turkey from the U. S. S. R. keeping Turkey on the anxious seat in this war of nerves. Those are the very reasons we are going to render assistance. The United Nations Charter in the articles I read enables the United States to proceed before the General Assembly if it does not want to go before the Security Council on these issues.

May I also point out that the Vandenberg amendment waives any effect of the veto in the Security Council on the action of the United Nations regarding this assistance program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. BREHM. Was this amendment presented in the full committee that the gentleman is now offering and, if so, was any disposition made of it?

Mr. JAVITS. The amendment which has been here presented was presented in a different form carrying the same idea, however, before the committee. The committee at that time by a division rejected it.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, may I say with reference to the Dardanelles, to which the gentleman has referred, that that is an entirely different question. In the dispute about the Dardanelles, Russia is the only nation that is concerned with the dispute who has not even replied to any suggestion which might be made with reference to the Dardanelles. Russia does want to go into the Dardanelles in one way. She wants to have her forts and men there. When she gets that, she will be in Turkey. Then, it will be too late to think of any legislation of any kind and you are beaten. There isn't any question about the Dardanelles situation. The gentleman is wrong. He knows that Russia is the only nation that has not yet suggested any statement or any kind of condition on which the Dardanelles should be operated in the future; and that is a positive fact.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, it would appear to me that the founders of the United Nations would favor very much the proposition that the United Nations should on the application of the United States, as a most devoted follower of the United Nations, act on this proposal.

Everything that has been said here indicates that there is external pressure on Turkey; and that is the only reason we are assisting. It cannot be economic difficulty in Turkey, as the gentleman from California so eloquently explained. The only reason we are going forward with this bill at all as to Turkey is on account of external pressure on her. If that is the reason and if the pressures are not so subtle that we can detect them, then they are not so subtle that the United Nations can fail to detect them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman there is one substitute amendment pending. Another substitute may not be offered until that is disposed of.

Mr. BENDER. May I offer an amendment to the substitute?

The CHAIRMAN. An amendment to the substitute may be offered but not another substitute.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

At last we have come to the meat of this whole situation. That is, do you want to proceed as outlined by the United Nations? Do you want to use the procedures and the facilities of the United Nations and make a multilateral approach to this problem, or do you want to make a unilateral approach? It all boils down to that. When all of the scare of communism, all of the cry that Turkey is in economic distress is cleared away, that is all there is to it. We know that Turkey's gold supply has gone up during the war from \$45,000,000 to \$245,000,000. She has got rich during the war by sitting still and not playing with either side, in spite of some of the things that have been said. She remained neutral and it was a profitable enterprise for Turkey. Now we come to the crux of the situation. Do we believe all the glittering pledges and promises that we made in the United Nations? Do we stand for the principles of collective security, or are we ready now to throw the United Nations in the ditch, and, by omitting to send to her this problem, say we are ready to go on our own and guarantee the sovereignty and integrity of every nation in the world, beginning first with Greece and Turkey and then going on to Korea, Indonesia, India, and on and on? Are we, a Nation of 140,000,000 people, to take over the great burden of policing the world, or would we like to have some help from the 47 nations or the 51 nations which have been supporting us in the United Nations? This is not the first problem that has been put up to the United Nations. Let me call to your attention the fact that there have been four. Lebanon-Syria was one problem. A complaint was made that the British and French troops were remaining in the country, contrary to the Charter agreement.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. No; I cannot yield. Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution expressing confidence that British and French troops would withdraw, and in May they were withdrawn.

In Indonesia there was another complaint which the Council, after consideration, decided against investigating.

In Spain there was another complaint, with a like result.

In Iran there was a complaint that Russian troops had not withdrawn from Iran, and in April Mr. Byrnes presented a resolution to the Security Council asking Russia to withdraw, and on May 6, according to the report of the Iranian Government, Russian troops withdrew from Iran.

So we have four precedents of serious international situations arising. Those situations were referred to the Security Council. Action was taken on them. This is the second anniversary of the United Nations. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM] helped to write those principles—those principles of multilateral approach to the problems of the world; of collective security. And you are departing from the sober principles written therein in this Greek- and Turkish-aid bill.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I have only 5 minutes.

This is the crux of the situation. Let us get down to it now. Do you believe in the United Nations? Do you want to support the principles of the United Nations? Or do you want to go alone?

I did not talk on the atomic-energy resolution. I am a member of the Joint Committee of the House and Senate on Atomic Energy. I do not want to talk on it now. I know, maybe, a little too much about it. I saw the explosions at Bikini. I visited the Japanese cities of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. I know that we have the bomb. I do not know whether Russia has it or not, or whether she will have it within a year's time or whether it will take longer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one additional minute.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 2 minutes, that I may ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, I wish to know whether we will be allowed the same liberality when some of us come to speak in opposition?

The CHAIRMAN. That is a question the Chair cannot answer.

Mr. LEMKE. Very well. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for two additional minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In the countries to which the gentleman referred I believe he stated troops were present. That is an entirely different situation from what we are debating here today. There are no foreign troops in Greece and Turkey.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I am sorry but I cannot let the gentleman take all of my 2 minutes. There are certain conditions—

Mr. BLOOM. But I asked that the gentleman might have an additional minute that I might ask him a question.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BLOOM. In each of the countries the gentleman mentioned there were foreign troops and that is why it came to the Security Council; but here there are no foreign troops involved.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Does the gentleman deny the fact that situations can be brought to the Security Council without the presence of troops in the respective countries?

Mr. BLOOM. But the gentleman did not say that. The gentleman is right, a member nation can bring anything it wants to the Security Council.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. All right; the gentleman has answered. That is all I asked the gentleman to answer.

Mr. BLOOM. But there is no similarity between those situations and the present one.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. There is a similarity in that an international situation arises at this point and when it arises any nation in the world can bring it to the attention of the Security Council. It does not have to be exactly the same situation. It can be brought to the Security Council by any member of the United Nations, and that is where it should be brought unless you want to embark upon a unilateral imperialistic program similar to the kind of program which has brought on every war in history. Here at last we have an opportunity to work through a United Nations organization and approach these things in a multilateral way. We say the United Nations is impotent, it is too weak. Mr. Chairman, how is it going to get strong unless it is provided exercise?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that it be read in full.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENDER to the substitute offered by the gentleman from New York:

On page 1, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and Turkey."

On page 1, line 6, strike out "Their governments" and insert in lieu thereof "its government."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "these countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 6, strike out "or Turkey."

On page 2, lines 10 and 11, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 18, strike out "those countries" and insert in lieu thereof "such country."

On page 2, line 20, strike out "countries" and insert in lieu thereof "country."

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it goes beyond the substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio if the page references are to the substitute amendment or to the bill.

Mr. BENDER. They are references to the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Do the page references and line references describe the substitute amendment or what?

Mr. BENDER. They describe the substitute amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York to that part of the bill which has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. Let us get this clear. We have a pending amendment and we have a substitute for that amendment. The gentleman from Ohio has offered an amendment to the substitute. The amendment consists of several references to pages and lines. Are those pages and lines a part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] as a substitute?

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, they are part of the bill, which has already been read.

The CHAIRMAN. That does not constitute an amendment to the substitute and the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last several words.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with any legislation attempting directly or indirectly to have this bill channeled toward the United Nations, we have to realize if that is done, for all practical purposes, this legislation and its effects and purposes will be defeated. As I view the situation, we are not bypassing the United Nations or its Charter.

The Charter of the United Nations does not authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." Both Greece and Turkey have solicited our aid for the speedy recovery and independence of those small countries. President Truman in his message to the Congress specifically said we are not bypassing the United Nations.

Let me briefly review the history. On at least three occasions the Greek problem has been presented to the Security Council, two times by Russia, when they claimed the British troops in Greece were a threat to peace, a charge which the Council rejected both times. It was presented again by the Greek Government on the ground that Russia's Balkan puppets—that is, certain Balkan states that are Russia's puppets—were waging an undeclared war against the Greek territory. On the latter charges a United Nations commission was appointed and they have been in Greece for some time. They have made investigations and they have made a report.

In connection with some remarks made by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], who would want to create the impression that the guerrillas are patriotic, fighting people, are not either Communists or controlled by the Communists, I call his attention to a report already made by the commission showing that the Communists in Greece were trained in Yugoslavia—that is the guerrillas—and also that the manual of arms which has been used by the Greek Communists or guerrillas was printed in the Greek language by the Russians in Moscow. My friend apparently has failed to keep in touch with current history.

The report also shows that the fighting along the northern border continued despite the presence of the United Nations commission in Greece.

We also must keep in mind that the Charter provides:

The members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state.

What is happening? There are Rumania, Bulgaria, Poland. We will not talk about Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. There is no more talk about their independence. I hope they will ultimately regain their independence. There are Hungary, Austria, Czechoslovakia, admitting that from a military standpoint the latter has to gravitate to the East, but they belong to the West. We know what that means. We can interpret that language when we read it,

coming from the head of that government.

Now, this threat against Greece. Greece and Turkey are like an apple, so geographically situated. You cut the apple in half. You cannot let one disintegrate and expect to save the other. You have to consider both parts together. You might just as well quit if you assist one and not the other. It is like cutting an apple in half and expecting to save one-half against the forces of destruction.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. A vital question in my mind is, Are we, by this, bypassing the United Nations organization? Does the gentleman contend that we are not bypassing the United Nations by this measure?

Mr. McCORMACK. We are not.

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not want to discredit or bypass the United Nations by this move and want to make sure we are not doing so now. Does the President of the United States make that clear in his message to the Congress?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The historical facts support that position. Now, let me continue. Back of Greece, what is there? Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is gone. We might just as well face the facts. I am not anti anything. I am pro in what I believe. I am pro-American; I am prowestern civilization. I believe in a civilization that all who believe in a Supreme Being possess. That is what our civilization is. Whether Catholic, Protestant, or Jew, we have and believe in the western civilization and what it stands for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MORRIS. The question is this: Does not the gentleman know that the committee itself in its report says that some of these bands are bands that we armed during the other war? That is shown on page 2.

Mr. McCORMACK. That does not change the situation at all. That does not change at all one statement that I made concerning the United Nations Commission, because in that war, in the war against Hitler, we armed anybody who would or was fighting Hitler. We were crossing the bridge with anybody in order to lick the first enemy and the immediate devil. Now, let us face the situation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. One gentleman said a while ago that the present King of

Greece was pro-Fascist and was in England during the war. If he had been pro-Fascist he would never have been in England during the war.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is a frank observation worthy of consideration.

But, let us go further. If Greece goes, Italy goes. If Italy goes, Europe is gone. Now, we have to face these facts realistically. If we just sit back and remain inactive, then Russia, with its onrush of international communism, simply takes over country after country with its minority forces, militantly operating, by any means that they can employ to obtain control of a government, and when they do, they liquidate the decent elements within the government. Tito is in Yugoslavia, a step across the Adriatic from Italy. If Greece goes, Italy is bound to go. That means the control of the Mediterranean. If there is one thing we have learned from history it is that the country that controls the Mediterranean controls Europe, and the country that controls Europe controls Asia and Africa. History has indisputably portrayed that lesson to us based upon hard experience.

What are some of the reasons why we are not bypassing the United Nations? Neither the United Nations nor any of its related organizations are in position to render the kind of help required, and even in the time necessary. The United Nations has no military force to enforce any decisions made by the United Nations organization. In the meantime, help cannot be given because the United Nations organization and its agencies have no money and could not loan money to either Greece or Turkey until security was assured. That is one of the conditions precedent to an international agency's lending money to any government, that security must be assured before the nation can receive a loan.

When an emergency exists, and everyone who studied the facts knows that the United Nations cannot act to meet the emergency, by our extending emergency aid we are not only acting in our national interest but are helping to establish the conditions which alone can enable the United Nations to function at all.

The United Nations is pretty much like the Thirteen Colonies were under the Articles of Confederation; that is the way I view it. We have to strengthen it. The United Nations is more or less impotent now, and it is impotent due to one country's failing to cooperate with understanding.

We have no imperialistic designs. Not so long ago the Members who serve here and in the other Chamber passed a law giving the Philippines their independence. Most of the Members here now were here then. Certainly, the United States is not imperialistically inclined when we are the first great Nation in the history of man to give up voluntarily territory of which we were possessed.

We have to act affirmatively. The challenge is direct. It is a challenge to our way of life. Nation after nation is being taken over. The way it is going, we have reached our last line of defense from the angle of our civilization in Europe. We cannot afford to let Greece

go. We cannot separate Turkey from Greece because of their geographical location. This involves Austria, it involves Germany. We know why the last conference at Moscow was a failure. They wanted to sap and destroy Austria economically. They would agree to Austria being a free nation, but it would not allow Austria any economic ability to maintain its freedom. The Russians have taken everything out of the area of Germany over which they have control, and they are now trying to sap the areas under the control of the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Chairman, I hope these amendments will be defeated.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to all the amendments and to make a statement which I have here to make.

Mr. Chairman, before this very illuminating debate ends, I should like to take a few moments to present my views of the foundation principles of the United Nations Organization and its relation to individual countries and to this particular problem. However, at this point I have a communication of the utmost importance which I wish to read, bearing upon the amendments now before us.

Personally, I hope that all three of these amendments will be defeated, and that we will not festoon this legislation with all kinds of unworkable suggestions, all of them coming from high motives and a desire to settle the problem, but as a practical result lowering the efficiency of the legislation and making it more difficult to enforce than it is now.

I have here a communication from Senator Warren Austin, with whom I was associated during the preparation of this Charter, and who I think you will all agree with me is one of the soundest and sanest thinkers in this Nation. He has been appointed by our President to represent this Nation in the United Nations Organization as our chief ambassador.

Yesterday I sent him a telegram asking him, if he did not consider it prejudicial to his official position, if he would be willing to inform the House, in this time of confusion, of his views on the reference of this legislation to the United Nations. He said, in answer to my telegram:

NEW YORK, May 8, 1947.

HON. CHARLES A. EATON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
House of Representatives.

In answer to your telegram:

In my opinion the United States program for aid to Greece and Turkey does not (repeat) not bypass the United Nations. On the contrary it would be a most essential act in support of the United Nations Charter and would advance the building of collective security under the United Nations.

The United States took the initiative in explaining the proposed United States program to the United Nations Security Council; my statements of March 28, 1947, and April 10, 1947, set forth in full the reasons necessitating the American-aid program and the relationship of this program to the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

I informed the Security Council on behalf of the United States that the United States will immediately register with the United Nations for publication by the Secretary General copies of agreements connected with the execution of this program which may be

entered into between Greece and the United States or between Turkey and the United States.

The Security Council, on the initiative of the United States, is already acting on that aspect of the Greek question with which it is now prepared to deal—the conditions on the northern Greek frontiers.

No organ of the United Nations can at this time provide financial and military assistance to the Greek Government of the emergency character required.

The proposed American program will assist in restoring stability and security in Greece and maintaining them in Turkey. When stable conditions are restored in Greece it should be possible to provide such further financial and economic assistance as might then be required through the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations and related specialized agencies.

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, earlier today I asked the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] to yield to me for some questions. I asked him whether he was convinced that the enactment of this measure would not be bypassing the United Nations organization and he gave me his prompt and positive reply that this does not do so. He further called attention to the President's message to the effect that this move does not indicate our intention to side-step the United Nations. To me that was gratifying assurance, for I want our Nation and our Government to continue to foster, to support, and to utilize properly and fully this new international organization which we helped make.

Now that we have heard the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON], chairman of the committee, read the letter from Senator Austin, our representative in the United Nations, to the effect that this move is not contrary to or inconsistent with our solemn duty as a member nation to the United Nations, we may feel further assured. My feeling of confidence in General Marshall as Secretary of State and of Senator VANDENBERG as one of the builders of the long-hoped-for United Nations organization deepens my assurance that they are not planning to do anything to the detriment of this young organization which is the hope of the world.

I have all along felt that the American Government made a colossal blunder when our Government repudiated the League of Nations a quarter century ago. It seemed certain to me then and still does seem certain that the power and influence of the United States was actively needed after the First World War to make the League of Nations effective, and we denied it then by our "act of omission." Destiny seems to have given America another chance to play her full and rightful part as befits her place in history. Opportunity did knock again and after a second terribly costly war we did join with more than 50 nations in organizing an international body to achieve justice and to prevent war. And now if before that babe is out of its swaddling clothes the Government of America repudiates it, not by an act of omission this time, but by a deliberate act of commission, it would be a far greater blunder than before. If the passage of this bill

means that America is "Driving a dagger into the heart of the United Nations organization", as has been claimed, I cannot support this move, for I am sure the American people do not approve anything that weakens, and will not permit anything that destroys the effectiveness of the United Nations organization. America will not desert this hope. That is why I have sought the assurance we have just received.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment and the substitute be again reported by the Clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk again reported the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill to give aid and assistance to war-devastated Greece and some financial support to Turkey. These two countries are strategically located overlooking the Mediterranean and the Black Sea. Turkey controls the Dardanelles. The independence of those two countries and their freedom from Russian domination are of vital importance to the future peace and security of the world.

We must not appease the Communists by bowing and scraping when our legitimate actions and policies are opposed by them. Those people recognize strength and firmness.

The passage of this bill will encourage free people in their resistance to the forces of communism. It will, in my opinion, be a deterrent of war and a promoter of peace. The appeasement of Japan and of Germany during recent years, so fresh on our minds now, led only to war. Let us profit from history, repudiate all evidence of isolationism on this subject and here uphold the Truman Doctrine as the symbol of hope and encouragement to free people to maintain their freedom and their national integrity.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, no legislative proposal ever submitted to the Congress since I became a Member on January 3, 1939, has caused me as much concern as the matter now before us; namely, a bill to implement President Truman's foreign

policy as submitted to the Congress on March 12 of this year.

Not a day has gone by since President Truman addressed a joint session of the Senate and House that I have failed to devote some part of the day to thought or study of this proposal. I recognize the importance of the decision we will make here in the House this week.

Those who urge that we vote for an appropriation of \$400,000,000 for aid to Greece and Turkey have been quite frank in stating that this should not be considered as a loan. It will be an outright grant. Nor do the proponents any longer claim that it is a relief bill in the usual sense of the word "relief." It has been admitted that about 75 percent of this appropriation will be spent for military equipment and supplies. It is also admitted that we will provide military personnel to serve as advisers for the Greek and Turkish Armies.

This proposal came as a shock to me. It is such a radical departure from what I envisioned would be the United States foreign policy following VJ-day. I recognized then and now our responsibility to aid other nations who as a result of the war badly needed food, clothing, medical supplies, seed, fertilizer, and so forth. Recognizing this responsibility, I voted last week against the motion that prevailed to reduce the foreign relief appropriation from three hundred and fifty to two hundred million dollars. I wanted to lean over backward in my effort to support fully the efforts of our Government to render relief to the hungry people abroad. Greece will receive a large part of these relief funds.

I said a moment ago that this program is so different from what I thought we would work out through the United Nations organization. It was my hope that we would unite with all other peace-loving nations of the world in a United Nations organization, and one of the first objectives of the UN would be to prevent any country from interfering with the sovereignty of any of its neighbors.

Some argue in connection with this legislation that we are not bypassing the United Nations organization. I just cannot understand that reasoning. We very definitely are embarking on a unilateral policy. No other member nation of the United Nations is participating with us in our effort to strengthen the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. We are going it alone, and the consequences will be ours alone.

It has been said during this debate that we must supply this military aid to Greece and Turkey to prevent the spread of communism. If that be the real reason for this appropriation, just how far will this program lead us and what will be its ultimate results. Are we going to provide funds to strengthen the armed forces of every nation in the world now threatened by the spread of communism? Certainly communism is a threat to France, to Italy, to Belgium, and even to the British Empire. Certainly no one will contend that we have the resources to make huge military grants to each of these powers.

I am not at all concerned by the charge that has been made that those who op-

pose this appropriation are alining themselves with Henry Wallace or that the opponents of this measure are sympathetic to Stalin's ambitions. In coming to a decision I have considered only the effect this foreign policy, if approved, will have on the future of the United States and on the United Nations' program as proposed in its Charter.

I have received a substantial number of letters on this Greek-Turkish aid proposition since President Truman first proposed it. With one exception, no one has written to me in favor of the whole program. Some urge "relief for Greece." Others propose that we send surplus military equipment to Greece and Turkey but no military personnel. Some favor aid to Greece but positively no aid or assistance for Turkey. Most of the people who have written to me and others with whom I have talked feel very strongly that this whole matter should be handled by the United Nations.

If, as the proponents of this legislation say, the United Nations is not prepared or strong enough to take over this task, that organization could be strengthened. I cannot understand why the United States acting alone is stronger than the United States acting with even a majority of the nations making up the United Nations organization. No member of the Foreign Affairs Committee has as yet explained how Russia could make use of her veto power to prevent other member nations of the UN from acting to prevent Russian expansion. After all, was not the real purpose of the United Nations to maintain world peace through force if necessary?

Very little information has been given us upon which we could base an intelligent decision. I finally decided to vote no on this proposition; and in reaching that decision, I have followed the dictates of my own conscience, after using to the best of my ability the brain with which I have been endowed.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to continue the remarks I began yesterday but which I did not have time to complete.

We have heard a lot said about our foreign policy but I still do not know what our foreign policy is. I did not know during World War II what it was, nor did any of the men in my outfit, nor any of my six brothers with whom I served in the armed forces of the United States during World War II.

I expounded a foreign policy yesterday that is new to this House but one which I believe will work, that is that the United States maintain its armed forces so strong that we will be in a position where the other nations of this world will have to appease the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard a number of Members on this floor talk about the League of Nations. I have heard a lot of people over the country say that if the United States had just joined the League of Nations after World War I we would have prevented World War II.

I heard the distinguished minority leader last night insinuate that very same thing, that if we had only joined the League of Nations it would have prevented World War II.

Mr. Chairman, I refute the argument that if we had joined the League of Nations with 100,000 men, no Air Force, a scrapped and depleted Navy, that Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito would have listened to us; but I say to you that had we joined the League of Nations, built a great Air Force, maintained our military power, then the chances are we would have prevented World War II.

The United Nations will not work today unless the United States of America maintains its armed might; and I say that in times of modern warfare to talk about the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, one or two bombs would neutralize the Dardanelles, or Gibraltar, or the Panama Canal. The only force that we can make sure will preserve the peace and security of the United States of America, as I said yesterday, and repeat today because I sincerely believe it, and the past history of the world proves it—is an Air Force that can strike at any portion of the world, an Air Force capable of dropping and willing to drop any weapons known to modern man. Knowing that we will use these weapons the Russians, realists that they are, will listen, but they will listen to nothing else.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: Page 2, line 11, after the words "in an advisory capacity only", strike out the semicolon, insert a comma and add the following: "Provided, however, That not more than 100 such personnel are to be utilized in either country at one time under the terms of this act without further authorization from Congress."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is very clear. It simply is to put into legislative language the understanding that has been agreed upon informally between the War Department and the various committees of the House and the Senate which have been dealing with this particular legislation. Many of you have been worried, as many good Americans outside of Congress have been worried, lest this aid to Greece and Turkey take on the aspect of an expeditionary force. That is not the intention at all of the administration spokesmen who sponsored it.

We have received the most solemn assurance that human beings can give that that is not their intention, that the only purpose of military men being sent to either Greece or Turkey is to advise and to counsel so as to enable their military people to learn to use the types of weapon which they are going to buy from us or perhaps be given by us.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the hearings in this connection. If you will look at page 108 of the hearings and follow me as I read the testimony you will see what I am driving at. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] was interrogating Secretary Patterson about the size of this military contingent and Secretary Patterson stated:

Secretary PATTERSON. I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate.

Then the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] proceeded:

Mr. VORYS. Does that cover both Greece and Turkey, the estimate of 10 to 40?

Secretary PATTERSON. That would only be in the case of Greece.

Mr. VORYS. I wonder about Turkey.

Secretary PATTERSON. In the case of Turkey, it would be comparable. We do not at all have the detailed knowledge in the case of Turkey that we have in the case of Greece. I think I indicated that in my statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Secretary, following up the line of questioning identified by Mr. VORYS, I think it would be very comforting to the American public if we could put something into the legislation which would spell out the facts you have talked about today about a military mission.

The language is a little indefinite.

That is as to the matter of a limited number of military personnel. Then I asked him this direct question:

Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?

Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

The Secretary says specifically he has no objection to that kind of limiting amendment. I appeal to you now as Members of a body having coordinate responsibility of government, along with the executive department, to measure up to your joint responsibility and write into this legislation those facts and understandings and agreements which the executive departments have given us in connection with this bill. Most of you have made campaign statements registering your desire to stop blank check legislating by Congress. Well the time has now come to do something about those statements. By writing in a number limitation such as I propose we measure up to our responsibilities and we retain added congressional control of both our foreign and domestic policies.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Was the amendment which the gentleman is now offering offered in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. It was discussed in committee, but I think it was not offered.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman quoted Secretary Patterson. Is it not a fact that later on in the testimony the Secretary said that he thought it would be unwise, and that he made a mistake when he said he did not see any objection to limiting the number?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find such testimony in the hearings, I will be happy to have him read it to the

House. I am unable to find such testimony.

Mr. RICHARDS. Did not the Secretary later on change his position?

Mr. MUNDT. If the gentleman can find anything in the hearings to indicate that, let him read it. I cannot find it there.

Let me point this out. I feel this way about this amendment. The War Department comes to us frequently as it does to the Committee on Appropriations and says, "We want some money to run the Department." I do not think we should give them an unstipulated amount simply because we have confidence in the War Department, as we all have. I think the Congress has the responsibility to place limitations on that amount, and I think we have the responsibility to place limitations on the amount of power which we vacate as a legislative body. We are vacating some authority in this bill necessarily, and I am simply asking that we limit the amount of power that we vacate in this matter of sending military personnel abroad in this bill to 100 men to each of the countries, because Secretary Patterson has said those are all the men that he intends to use; twice as many as he intends to use, in fact. Let us therefore put in writing as a part of this legislation this limitation which can always be changed should necessity arise by subsequent action by the Congress.

My plea is simply against writing blank-check legislation unnecessarily. It is a bad habit to get into and we should avoid it when we can. We have an opportunity to do so now. I urge your support for this clarifying amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise mainly in order to propound a question or two to the author of the amendment, if I may have his attention.

Is the gentleman sure that this amendment was not considered and voted down in committee?

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure. I say, it was discussed in committee. I do not recall that it was voted down, because the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS] offered a substitute, and I am not sure that either of them were voted on. It may have been.

Mr. JARMAN. Is the gentleman sure that Secretary Patterson did not later on say that he made a mistake when he said, "No."

Mr. MUNDT. I am not sure about any mistake Mr. Patterson may or may not have made. I am only sure about what appears in the printed record, and I am sure he has not said anything on the Senate side or the House side to contradict that.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is not sure that he did not hear him say that?

Mr. MUNDT. I certainly am sure that I have not heard that he did not have any objection to any kind of limitation exceeding 100 men.

Mr. JARMAN. But the gentleman is sure that he did not hear him say later on that he was opposed to it, is he?

Mr. MUNDT. I do not know what the gentleman is driving at. I ask the gentleman from Alabama the same question I asked the gentleman from South Carolina, if he has any reason to think there is other testimony in the record, let him read it to the Committee. Here is the sworn testimony of the Secretary on page 108.

Mr. JARMAN. I will answer that by saying we had many executive sessions.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. Is it not a fact that the specific question was asked of the Secretary in executive session and the Secretary said that he did make that statement in the opening meeting at the time, but that he wanted to change his mind, and he said that he would prefer not to have the number of people limited in the bill. That was in executive session. That is why it is not in the record.

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I gladly yield to the able gentleman from California.

Mr. JACKSON of California. My remembrance of the Secretary's testimony is that his original agreement upon the size of the mission in Greece and Turkey would be predicated upon whether or not the mission now there, the British mission, would remain, but I very definitely remember, and I agree with the gentleman, that the Secretary said it would be most unwise, in the second hearing, to tie the hands of his Department or of the Navy Department in reference to this point.

Mr. JARMAN. I thank the gentleman very much. I ask my colleagues of the House, please, do not tie the hands of our departments in an important matter such as this, in view of the testimony we have about it here today.

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. MERROW. May I say that in my opinion this is a crippling amendment. If we have any confidence left in the President of the United States and in the State Department and in General Marshall, we should not put this amendment into this bill.

Mr. JARMAN. I thoroughly agree with the gentleman who is one of the ablest members of our committee, and I might add that we should not do so if we have any confidence in the Secretary of War, who is—well, I will not say what party he belongs to.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was present at the hearings when the Secretary of War said he saw no objection to such an amendment limiting the number of military advisers to be sent to Greece and Turkey. Then I was ill for a few days and missed two committee meetings, but I certainly did not hear until just now of the reported retraction of his statement. However, if the Secretary of War later

came before the committee in executive session and asked that we not put any restriction of this sort in the bill, which would leave the door open to an expeditionary force, that is all the more reason, I think, why the amendment should be adopted.

I am for this bill. I have crusaded for 16 years against appeasement of any country expanding its territory by aggression. I spoke the best I could for this bill on yesterday and will again if I get a chance. But what I am for is our aiding free countries struggling to maintain their independence, by our sending over material assistance and selected officers and men to review and screen the needs and requests and to see that the assistance we send is well used. I cannot for a moment support the bill if perchance by any stretch of interpretation of language it could permit an expeditionary force, or even a battalion of our armed forces to go into these countries either in addition to British troops or in substitution for British troops. If the day should come when that sort of thing is needed, I feel that those in charge must come again before the Congress and make their case. If they make a good case, Congress presumably would support it. But I cannot go along with any other interpretation, and I am constrained to support and urge the committee to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. The gentleman well knows that the bill provides that these military men we send over are to act in an advisory capacity only. By no means could that interpretation be stretched to mean combatants.

Mr. JUDD. Then, what possible objection can the gentleman have to putting into the bill that which would so enormously reassure the people of America. I think we would pick up a great many more votes here in the House of Representatives, if all were sure military personnel is to be limited to a definite number of officers and men for training and by no possible construction include, to use the gentleman's word, combatants.

Mr. KEE. The objection I have to it is this. The Secretary returned to the committee after he made the statement quoted by the gentleman from Minnesota and said it would be crippling to his Department if they wanted to send a few more advisory men, and asked us not to insert any limitation.

Mr. JUDD. Would the gentleman object to 200, then?

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BLOOM. It was stated at the time, if I remember correctly—this was in executive session; perhaps I should not say that—it was stated that if they thought of sending a battleship over there and they had more than a hundred men on that ship, according to the bill, they could not send the battleship over there.

Mr. JUDD. Certainly the gentleman is not suggesting that sending battleships would come under the authorization of this act. Of course, they could be sent by the Commander in Chief for visits under his present authority.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not mean for military purposes or for war purposes, but they could not go over there if it could be construed that they would send that many people on one ship.

Mr. JUDD. This reads "in an advisory capacity only." Surely we would not be sending over a battleship in an advisory capacity.

Mr. BLOOM. The gentleman was talking about combatant troops.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is exactly right. I do not know exactly the attitude of the former chairman. He says, "I am telling you what happened in an executive session here or an executive session there." I believe an executive session is an executive session, so I am not going to discuss those matters. But let me say this: My amendment says, under the purposes of this act, limit it to 100. It has nothing to do with a battleship, because sending a battleship over there is something else. I am talking about the purposes of this act and the 100 limitation which Secretary Patterson said is twice as many men as he needs.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RICHARDS. I am not talking about battleships or soldiers being sent over there. That is not in the realm of possibility under this bill. What I wanted to ask the gentleman is this: Would it not be ridiculous to embark on a courageous policy such as is proposed here today and spend \$400,000,000 of the taxpayers' money under a limitation that only 100 military advisory personnel could be sent, and then tell the Secretary of War or the President that even if he deemed it necessary he could not send 150 men over there to see that that money was wisely spent?

Mr. JUDD. I will state to the gentleman that I am willing to amend the amendment to increase the limit to 200. I certainly do not want us to be crippled or hampered in doing well what we are authorizing. My point is that we must not authorize more than was told us or than we have told the House and the country is the purpose of this bill. It is to make our people sure that we will not under this bill be sending over any large groups. I know that we do not intend to do that, but a great many millions of Americans are more disturbed on this point than on any other.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this amendment is just one more illustration of the feeling that a great many people have that if we only tie our own hands we are safe. I say this with considerable reluctance because I have a very high regard for the gentleman from

South Dakota. He is a good friend of mine. But over the years in this country there seems to have been a feeling on the part of many fine citizens that we should be fearful of our own power and that, therefore, if we can shackle Uncle Sam we are really going to be able to have peace.

In the first place, the British mission in Greece—I do not have the exact figure before me—I believe numbers around four or five hundred. If they for some reason or other have to withdraw, under this amendment we could not provide the personnel to take their place.

I believe that the reason for this amendment is the fear that some incident may arise between some American in uniform and—some Greek guerrilla, perhaps—which would arouse in us back here a desire to pursue the matter with explosive consequences. I would just like to say that one of my oldest friends was a naval attaché in Warsaw, a colonel in the Marine Corps. He was murdered and I do not recall that there was much about it in the press.

I would like to say further that you do not avoid trouble by simply limiting the number of military personnel. A civilian can be a cause of disturbance just as readily as a man in uniform. I believe that the men in uniform that we have to worry about are not the Americans. I believe that it is time that we made our meaning entirely clear, and that if we are going to pass this measure we should not handicap those who are charged with its execution.

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. BUSBEY. The gentleman spoke about shackling Uncle Sam. If this bill passes, do you think we are shackling Uncle Sam by giving \$400,000,000 under this program?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly do not.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. May I call the attention of my friends the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] to the specific language of the bill, which is very plain and capable of only one construction. I quote:

by detailing a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries in an advisory capacity only.

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad that the gentleman from Massachusetts stressed that language.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I am very glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I got the implication from the gentleman's remarks, which I might add were very frank, that these forces that we are sending over might possibly replace the British who are there now numbering about 500, I believe.

Mr. LODGE. I am afraid I did not make myself clear. They are not forces. These are men we are sending over to screen military and naval demands and

to act in an advisory capacity only, according to the language of the bill. The British have a large mission there, and it might become advisable or necessary, in view of the fact that most of the equipment will be ours, that the British retire some of their men and that we take their place.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Are the British there in an advisory capacity or in a shooting capacity? Are they armed or are they just advisers?

Mr. LODGE. The British mission is there in an advisory capacity. The British forces which consist, I believe, of a brigade—about 10,000 men—are there for policing purposes.

Oh, the mission is there, naturally, not in a shooting capacity. The purpose of the mission is not to shoot. The purpose of a soldier is to shoot.

Mr. CHENOWETH. But if we go there we will shoot.

Mr. LODGE. No. I am talking about combat troops.

Mr. CHENOWETH. They will be armed, will they not?

Mr. LODGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. I am afraid he has not quite got the distinction in mind.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LODGE. I yield.

Mr. JUDD. Will not the gentleman agree that under the present language we could have an adviser in every company in the Greek Army or even in every squad?

Mr. LODGE. I suppose it would be impossible for any lawyer to draft a contract or a law that could not be abused by someone who wanted to do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Judd to the amendment offered by Mr. Mundt: Strike out the figure "100" and insert the figure "200."

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to limit the proper activities of the President and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of Navy in carrying out this act which I feel involves what may ultimately be almost a life and death matter for the United States. I mean just that in all seriousness. But I cannot believe we ought to pass this piece of legislation without making crystal clear to every mother and father and citizen in the United States exactly what we are doing. I cannot believe, on the basis of any testimony I have heard, that they can rightly object to a limitation of 200 by the War Department and 200 by the Navy Department. That seems to me a generous estimate of what "a limited number of members of the military services of the United States to assist those countries, in an advisory capacity only," could mean. So I hope that many who have been opposing this amendment to limit to 100 will accept it on the basis of 200. It seems to me it improves the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JUDD. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. This is the first time in my life I ever heard of any missionary advocating that this country send military men to try to Christianize people. I have never heard any missionary or a church advocate that we should send only a hundred or 200 armed men into any country to try to aid and assist them in a Christian way. I hope the gentleman will eliminate all armed men that we are talking about sending into Greece and Turkey, and send more missionaries and more medical missionaries over there.

Mr. JUDD. So far as I know no one has suggested we send military men to any country to try to Christianize people. We are suggesting that it is right and proper and sensible to send military men to threatened peoples to help them retain their independence instead of allowing them to be murdered or enslaved as people have been wherever Communists have taken over. It so happens that my own church has had missionaries and medical missionaries in Greece and Turkey for many decades. Does the gentleman think he can send missionaries to any people dominated by Russian communism? If the gentleman will examine the record of the person who is speaking, he will discover that all during the 1930's, when I was taking fragments of American scrap iron out of the bodies and brains of innocent Chinese men, women, and children, I was trying my best to get my country to adopt a policy of not helping an aggressor, a policy which would prevent murder of the people of Asia and of the United States. I am for this bill because I believe it will prevent, or greatly reduce, the murder of people in Europe and probably of Americans, too. I think that is a worthy cause for a missionary, especially a missionary doctor, to support.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] has expired.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and the amendment to the amendment.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] has just said this is a question of most vital importance to the welfare of our country. He is correct in that. But if his statement is true, why shackle the United States? If the amendment limiting the number of this kind of personnel to 100 is bad, then it follows that a limitation of 200 is bad. I think it would be unwise for the Congress of the United States to embark on a policy such as we propose here today, costing \$400,000,000, and then to say to the President of the United States and the Secretary of War, "You must go over there and carry out the purposes we have expressed in this legislation, but you are limited to 100 or 200 of a certain kind of personnel that it is absolutely necessary for us to have on the ground to make this program a success."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The phraseology of the bill is "a limited number and in an advisory capacity only." These phrases have got to be considered together. "Limited" means the minimum number

necessary to carry out the policies of this act.

Mr. RICHARDS. I hope this amendment and all amendments to it will be killed.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. The word "limited," to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers, means absolutely nothing unless Congress exercises its right and authority and describes it in certain terms. "Limited" could mean 100,000 as well as 100 or 200. It all depends on who is administering the act. We are defining the word "limited" as meaning not more than 200 to act in an advisory capacity.

I would remind the gentleman from Massachusetts that that is what the British say they are doing with 10,000 men in Greece, acting in an advisory capacity.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I realize, of course, that a logical argument can be made from that angle, but what does the gentleman have to say about the phrase "advisory capacity only?"

Mr. MUNDT. I say in answer to that that the British say their troops are over there solely in an advisory capacity, yet they have 10,000 of them there. I suppose they are advising the people to maintain law and order.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. The bill contemplates that part of the aid to be sent to Greece may be such things as airplanes and tanks.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. MONRONEY. Then, how can we expect to train these people in the use of this mechanized equipment with 100 men or 200 men? I do not think it can be done. We have got to have mechanics and servicemen.

Mr. RICHARDS. It is absurd to think so.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I was wondering if the gentleman had figured out in dollars and cents the cost of 100 or 200 or many more? And also I think it is important that this membership should know that we are not talking in the terms of the brigade of British soldiers that are there in camp, we are talking only in terms of permission.

Some of us have felt very deeply troubled because there was no limitation in this, because of some of the rumors that have been going about. I believe it is because of that that this amendment has been offered by the gentleman from South Dakota. If we could reassure the people of this country that what we are sending into Greece is a mission, not troops; that it is a limited mission and that we do not propose to permit the situation to become such that the army could use the \$400,000,000 and nobody else get anything the people would feel better. The point and purpose of this proposal, as I

see it, is not troops but it is economy of various kinds, bankers, specialists, and so on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the substitute amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that somebody is letting the cat out of the bag. One of the things which really concerns the people of America in the consideration of this legislation is this question of military personnel. The bill says "a limited number of members of the military services." How many constitute "a limited number"? I think the best evidence on this point is to be found in the hearings before the committee at page 351 where the following statement is made:

Secretary Forrestal suggested before the committee that perhaps at the outset 3 or 4 naval officers and possibly 20 or 25 men would be sufficient for the limited purpose of advising the Greek authorities. Secretary Patterson indicated a rough estimate of approximately between 10 and 40 Army officers might be adequate for similar purposes.

They are only supposed to serve in an advisory capacity.

The Mundt amendment raises the figure to 100 men in Greece and 100 men in Turkey. In the substitute amendment presented by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Judd] the figure is raised to 200. This is a limitation which the fathers and mothers of America want. I am sure that much of the correspondence Members of Congress have received on this bill is to the effect that the people of the country are generally in favor of giving relief to the starving women and children of Greece, but they are afraid of the military features of the bill.

I do not care whether you call members of the military services advisors or not. It is very easy under this loose language to have 15,000 or more advisors on the ground. It seems to me that the statements made by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, as to the number of men actually needed as advisors should bear great weight. The hearings specifically state the number they need. The amendments proposed therefore are generous indeed and we should write the limitations into the bill.

Mr. Chairman, in order to allay the fears of the fathers and mothers of America it is my firm conviction that a definite limitation as to the number of military personnel and advisors that are to go into Greece and Turkey, should be written into the bill. Therefore I shall support the Judd substitute and if that fails, I expect to support the original amendment proposed by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt].

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I object. Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Preferential motion offered by Mr. BENDER: "Mr. BENDER moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken."

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, you have a demonstration of how hell will break loose in Greece and Turkey in the way hell has broken loose here in the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Apparently there is a difference of opinion as to what this person heard and what the other person heard. One thing I know is that day before yesterday the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Smith] and a number of other gentleman were in my office at which time there was present a young lady who was employed by UNRRA in Greece and who was shot by British bullets in Greece.

You are going into a shooting business when you go into this thing. When you go into this on the \$400,000,000 basis, you are just beginning. For example, this story has been kept out of the newspapers, and so far there has been a successful attempt to keep it secret, but I understand that behind the walls of the State Department there is great excitement and frantic scurrying around over the report that American equipment for five full divisions of Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist Army in China has fallen into the hands of the Chinese Communist forces.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I expect there is considerable agitation in the State Department. But this is just the sort of thing which we can expect under the Truman doctrine of sending military supplies to unrepresentative regimes on the theory of stopping communism.

All we will accomplish is to promote and prolong civil wars. Yes, we can send American materials of war to Greece and Turkey, to every trouble spot in the world—but we will wake up to find that the same thing is happening to it as is happening in China.

If this is the State Department's way of maintaining American prestige and security in the world—by dropping American taxpayers' money down the drain—I say it is a very poor way indeed.

This bill provides that two-thirds of the money is to be spent for military equipment to engage in civil war in Turkey and Greece. Now you are talking about sending 100 men or 200 men. What difference does it make? Hell will break loose just as hell is breaking loose on the floor of this House and in the Committee on Foreign Relations as the result of the controversy over this matter.

My friends, we are advocating that this thing be handled by the United Nations. That is not isolationism. I heard the distinguished gentleman from

Texas last night make an eloquent appeal against isolationism. Well, it is isolationism to engage in this unilateral program of ours when we have the United Nations to work through. Why not refer this matter in just that way?

I say that we are not going to be rushed into immediate passage of this measure if we have to sit here all next week. I trust there are a sufficient number of persons on the floor of this House who are interested and wish to be heard. We have good amendments on the desk here. We have amendments that should be considered in the manner in which we consider amendments on other measures.

This is the most important measure that we have had before us since I have been a Member of Congress during the past five terms. No other legislation has been as important as this. No other legislation will involve us in so much trouble, in so many heartaches, in so much bloodshed, as this measure will. I trust that we will consider this and not give this thing the bum's rush which obviously is attempted here in considering this amendment in 5 or 10 minutes. Let us take plenty of time. We can stay here from early morning until late at night. The majority leader said, "How about your amendments?" I said, "I am going to offer every one of them." He said, "Do you think we ought to meet in the morning at 10 o'clock?" I said, "You can meet at 9 o'clock and you can sit until midnight; you can meet on Saturday and you can meet on Monday and consider this thing the way it should be considered and not in a slipshod, haphazard manner."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCORMACK. My point of order is that on the pending amendment the period of debate is 10 minutes; 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against.

The CHAIRMAN. That is, if someone claims 5 minutes in opposition.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, if no member of the committee or anyone else desires to rise in opposition, I seek recognition.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, according to the rules defined by the distinguished gentleman, the point is well taken.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will not press the point of order.

Mr. EATON. I think the point of order is well taken.

Mr. RAYBURN. Why do we not vote on this amendment now?

Mr. EATON. Of course, that is what I want to do. Everybody understands what this does. It kills the bill. If we want to kill the bill, let us vote on it and decide now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. VORVY) there were—ayes 37, noes 127.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I wonder if we cannot reach an agreement to limit debate on these amendments. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. BUSBEY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think it was generally understood that everyone was going to be given a chance to debate this bill and the amendments thereto. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs would not press his unanimous-consent request because I do not like to be in the position of objecting. I think every Member that is on his feet ought to have 5 minutes to speak on these amendments, because we are getting into the same situation here as we did before, of turmoil, of everybody hollering to vote, vote, vote, and not listening to the debate. I think it would be a good thing under the conditions if the Committee rose.

Mr. HALLECK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I said earlier that there would be no effort made as we progressed here a reasonable period of time through today, and tomorrow, if necessary, to limit debate in the consideration of this measure. The gentleman from New Jersey indicated in connection with his request that debate be limited to 10 minutes on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto that he wondered how many wanted to speak. I am quite sure he would be perfectly willing to amend his request. It is not a motion, it is a request subject to objection. No one wants to force anyone to object. If those who want to speak will rise and so indicate, then the time can be adjusted.

Mr. McCORMACK. Is that on this amendment?

Mr. HALLECK. Yes; and the amendments thereto. That does not limit debate. If everyone who wants to speak will rise, I am quite sure the chairman will amend his request in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. The request as it stands is for a limitation of 10 minutes. Does the gentleman from New Jersey care to amend his request?

Mr. EATON. I would be glad to do so. I want everybody to have a chance to have his say. How many wish to speak on this amendment and all amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentleman that a tally by the Clerk shows 14 Members have arisen.

Mr. EATON. I withdraw my request, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of both the substitute amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDT] and the original amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. I have a like amendment at the Clerk's desk which would limit the military personnel in either country to 100. I mentioned that earlier in the debate today. It is not particularly material whether the number be fixed at 100 or 200, but certainly it seems to me there should be some limitation on the number of military forces which we send to these two countries.

The Secretary of War testified at page 108 of the record, in answer to a question by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORVY] that anywhere from 10 to 40 military personnel is the present estimate in Greece and a comparable number in Turkey. Following that, he was asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I quote:

Mr. MUNDT. In order that Congress can have its part in shaping the legislation and our policy in Greece and Turkey, I have in mind an amendment to offer which would limit the size of the American military mission in each country to a maximum of 100, which would be over twice the number that you would say would be required. Would you have any objection to that kind of clarifying amendment?

Secretary PATTERSON. No, sir.

Now the point is made that on some other occasion, at some other place, he corrected this testimony and asked, in effect, for no limitation whatever on the size of the forces which we might send to these countries. I have the highest regard for our distinguished Secretary of War and am very anxious that none of my remarks should in any way be construed as critical of him. I am sure that he would be, as many of us would, the last one to take any step which would involve this country in armed conflict. He has been a fighting soldier and knows what war is. I realize, too, that considerations of security may require that not all of the testimony which was given before the Committee on Foreign Affairs shall be spread upon this record. It is only natural that the Secretary of War, in the discharge of his duties, should prefer to have complete and uncontrolled discretion.

If these amendments should fail I shall still vote for this bill for the reasons I have given earlier today. But it is my sincere hope that a majority will see the merit in the proposal which has here been made, for I cannot escape the feeling that we, as a Congress, are charged with a heavy responsibility to see to it that nothing is done to alter the essential character of the legislation which we are about to adopt.

No one from the distinguished committee which reports this bill, no one in the unanimous report of the parallel committee in the other body, has indicated to us that it is the intention to send any substantial numbers of American officers or men to either of these countries. The committee report, here, at the bottom of page 4, says:

Combat forces are not to be sent to Greece or Turkey. The military assistance provided in the bill is to consist only of arms and

other supplies for the armed forces of Greece and Turkey. These supplies are to be provided on the basis of investigations and recommendations by small military missions sent out by the United States in an advisory capacity only. Testimony of Government witnesses indicates that the military mission to Greece would probably not exceed 40 and the naval mission would probably be less than 30. In the case of Turkey it is expected that the missions would not be larger.

It is in reliance upon these assurances, given to us in entire good faith, that many of us are supporting this measure. Those assurances, I know, will still hold good if these amendments are defeated. But it seems to me that we should, by the adoption of one of these amendments, make it crystal clear to the mothers and fathers and wives of the young men of this country that we have not embarked upon a militaristic venture, that forces are not being sent to these countries to fight, that they are not shooting soldiers, but simply advisers to the appropriate authorities in these two countries.

The point is made by the gentleman from Massachusetts that the words "limited" and "advisory" in section 1, paragraph 3 of this bill should be accepted as sufficient indication of a limitation. I may say to the gentleman that during my service in the China-Burma-India theater we were supposed to have a limited number of military personnel in China for, if not advisory, at least, training purposes only. But that number ran into thousands and thousands of officers and men. For the most part, and with few exceptions, they were not there to fight a shooting war, but for advisory and training purposes of the Chinese Army. I know nothing of that kind is intended in this present measure. If it were, I would never support it. It would be a negation of the first point made in my remarks earlier today that this is a step toward peace and not toward war. But my point is that the people of this country are apprehensive and we should give them the assurance, by clear language, that no such purpose is envisioned by this legislation.

As I said before, I should not want to undermine this bill by supporting a crippling amendment. I do not consider these, Mr. Chairman, to be such. They seem to me to be clarifying provisions which should merit our favorable response.

I regret that I find myself in disagreement on this point with the distinguished chairman and majority of the members of this committee which has labored so assiduously over this bill. I could not be easy in my conscience, however, were I to oppose an amendment which simply, as I construe it, says that we mean by this bill to carry out exactly what the committee has told us in their report, nothing more and nothing less.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEATING. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Does not the gentleman agree with me also that when a man of the responsible position of Secretary of War, not just in an offhand remark but through a discussion of several pages

of hearings insisted that he does not expect to use over 40 or 50 men and says he does not object to a limitation of 100, certainly he would not object to a limitation of over 200. Yet, there are those who say they have heard whispers in the dark that he does object. There is still time before we vote to go to the telephone and call him and then tell the House in public that he wants no limitation. I do not think he is going to say that. Congress has a responsibility in this matter.

Mr. KEATING. May I say to the gentleman, if the Secretary does mean that, there is certainly no evidence before us to that effect, which I am sure he, as a distinguished former jurist, would agree we should have, to form the basis for any decision to oppose these amendments. In the absence of any such testimony, we should accept the record before us to the effect that about 70 military and naval personnel in both these countries is the number contemplated.

Mr. MUNDT. The Senate committee brings out the same point. I think the country has the right to have the assurance of Congress that we are supporting the Secretary of War in his suggested limitation, but let us not have any more blank checks. They can become dangerous and expensive experiments.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman entirely and thank him for his helpful comments.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING] has expired.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendments.

We certainly ought not continue to try to fool the American people, try to soft-soap them and give out sop to the American people that we are entering into this thing of the United States becoming the world policeman and that we are going to limit it by legislation to a hundred or two hundred men. What is the purpose of this bill? One of the purposes is to furnish military aid to equip and train a Turkish Army of about 500,000 men. We are going to send tanks and guns and everything else that is necessary over there to equip the Turkish Army. Now, we are attempting to save the American people by saying there is not going to be any war come of this, because we are just going to send a hundred or two hundred men over there in an advisory capacity. Does that make sense?

I am opposed to this bill, but even so, if you are going to pass the bill I do not want to hamstring the people who are going to put the legislation into effect by saying, "You can have only 100 or 200 people to go over there to spend all these millions of dollars in Turkey." This legislation is a military project. No one denies that. I cannot just understand how my colleagues, the gentleman from Minnesota, Dr. Judd, and the gentleman from South Dakota, Karl Mundt, for both of whom I have the greatest respect, could offer such amendments as these if they are genuinely for this bill. It would be the same thing if we would say to

the President of the United States, "We are going to declare war on Russia tomorrow but we are going to limit you as to military strength. You can have only three or four divisions to fight the war with. We think that is enough." We ought to be frank about this thing.

Now, under this bill we are going over there. What for? To fence Russia in. Is anyone so gullible as to believe that such an undertaking is a job for 100 or 200 men?

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. The gentleman is taking a consistent position. At the top of page 108, when the Secretary was asked about the number of men, he said:

I would say anywhere from 10 to 40. That is our present estimate. We base that in part upon the assumption that the British Military Mission will continue in Greece for the time being at least.

But if that estimation does not come to pass, what if the British Mission does pull out? How many men would you need then?

Mr. RIZLEY. Of course, I think the gentleman is correct. It seems to me to be child's play to get up here and say we are genuinely for this thing, we are going into this all-out Truman policy to police the world if necessary, but we are going to limit you to a couple of hundred men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did you hear the Secretary of War before your committee the other day testify that the United States was going to be the boss of the world?

Mr. RIZLEY. I do not remember that; but this policy, of course, contemplates just that.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. JARMAN. I wish to heartily commend the gentleman on his very statesmanlike attitude. He is opposed to the bill; but if it is going to pass, he does not want the President to be hamstrung. I wanted to ask the gentleman this question. I wonder if it would have made any difference whether we had a law on the statute books prohibiting the sending of over 20,000 men abroad on the day of Pearl Harbor.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman's question answers itself, of course. You can tell the American people that we are going to send their boys over in an advisory capacity but when the first American boy is shot everyone knows that the American people, of course, will then spend all the money they have and all the men they have and then the third world war will be under way. That is the reason I am opposed to the bill, and certainly I am not going to try to soft-soap the American people now by saying that we are going to send only a hundred or two hundred men.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIZLEY. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. Is it not also a fact that if we are going to stop Russia and if it is going to do any good, we have got to convince Russia that we mean it; and we will never convince her that we mean it by sending a few men over there and then saying we are not going to back them up.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

If my friends who are supporting the Truman policy of having America police the world, and take on all comers who disagree with Mr. Truman all over the world and who favor this sort of military alignment, they should frankly tell the American people that they are backing the policy with every dollar we possess and with the lives of every American son who can tote a gun.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PFEIFER. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to granting military aid in any form. It will be a dangerous precedent. I do recommend, however, that any money spent in either country should be used to build schools, hospitals, missions, and so forth, and to feed the hungry.

I believe in relief and reconstruction.

I agree with Paul A. Porter, chief of the American Economic Mission to Greece, in that outside assistance is required for the survival of a democratic Greek state and we must make available funds for reconstruction and rehabilitation.

I have always favored a foreign policy of friendly relations with all countries and domination by none.

Why now this sudden anticommunistic action, when we permitted the division of Poland and the overrunning of the Balkans by the communistic forces, in fact, aided them; permitted placarding and the dissemination of material and propaganda in Italy so that in the last election the Communists polled 1,250,000 votes; informed the world through our action in the United Nations Assembly in that we condemn General Franco, who is the only man that has been and still is fighting communism?

Communism cannot be fought with money or bullets. It can be fought successfully only by feeding the people, sheltering the people, making them feel secure and free of fear and want.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, am not in favor of this bill due to its military-aid clause, and therefore will vote against it.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the attempts to define what "advisory capacity" means from a military point of view. Let me tell you it is absolutely meaningless.

I have seen the preliminaries of two World Wars in which this Nation has been engaged. I remember the maneuvering very well, as, being an adult in the naval service, I knew that I should be an active participant in them. Mr. Chairman, the present set-up is the same in substance as those which led up to World Wars I and II. In both cases we gave powers to the President which permitted him to get us into the war without the consent of the Congress. The Congress believes that it has the sole power to declare that a state of war exists for this Nation. It is merely fooling itself—suffering under a delusion—for in both of the two great World Wars we have fought the Nation was in the war under Executive directives before the matter was put up to the Congress. The Congress was merely a rubber stamp; it only confirmed what was already a fact—that a state of war existed. Are we going to do that again by granting this blank-check authority in this bill? Are we going to allow the administration to maneuver us into a position from which there is no way out except war or backing water in the face of the world? Are we going to send unlimited military personnel to get us embroiled in European squabbles? I know that the bill says that military personnel shall act in "an advisory capacity only." But just what does that mean, anyhow? Are American military aviators sitting in the observers' seat alongside the pilot in a combat plane advisers or combatants? Are American naval officers on board a fighting ship which may be sunk by the enemy advisers or fighting personnel? You know the answer as well as I do. They are combatants, and there is no other way to look at it. They are just as much combatants as were the American Army aviators who were sent to China to fight against the Japanese while we were still neutral.

Military and civilian personnel occupy quite different places in the category of reasons for international trouble. Civilians can be expended without any great accounting therefor, but military personnel abroad are recognized as clear-cut representatives of the nation they serve. When the time comes that some of the "members of our military services" who are acting in "an advisory capacity only" are killed in combat with Soviet forces we shall howl for vengeance and the fighting part of the third world war will be right on our doorsteps.

Perhaps we think that the probable gains justify the risks we shall assume. In that event I have no criticism. My sole object is to bring the terrific risks of this bill to your attention.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. Gladly.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The gentleman from Oklahoma made a statement to the effect that the reaction in this country would be terrific if only one American were killed in this undertaking. Last summer when Yugoslavia shot down six of our American flyers, there was nothing done about it. They were not even brought before the International Court of Justice of the United Nations for an

accountability of their actions. I doubt very much if there is going to be any arousing over this situation since we passed that incident over.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Is the gentleman satisfied if we are to take action to stop communism in Greece and Turkey that we ought to immediately take it from a military standpoint?

Mr. BRADLEY of California. I would not quite say that. I am very much distressed about where we are going from here, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my remarks I concede that the proposition to make these loans to Greece and Turkey is such that even the closest friends could differ about it.

I criticize no Member of the Congress for voting for this proposal, although I intend to vote against it for what, to me, appear compelling reasons.

We are given only two little glimpses, so to speak, of this whole proposition, the final pattern of which may be, and probably will be, a third world war. If this eventuates, we would have to fight alone and unaided. There is not a nation in all Europe which could or would engage in another war at this time to help us even though they were so inclined. This time they would expect us to do it all—finance it, fight it, and feed them while doing it. The result undoubtedly would be an impoverished America left depleted of its resources, insolvent, confused, and bewildered in a world of chaos.

The administration—and I refer, of course, to the executive branch of the Government—has not seen fit to be frank with us. They have not informed us as to what the whole of this new foreign policy is, or what it involves.

We are asked to extend loans which we must concede are military loans to be directed explicitly at preventing the expansion of Soviet despotism throughout Europe, Asia, and the Orient.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of propositions on which the Congress and the American people are entitled to enlightenment before this proposal is voted on.

In the first place, is this the first step in a move to actually stop Russia, even though it may lead to another long and bloody war?

In the second place, if it is the first step in a move to force the iron curtain back to the borders of Russia, does anybody know what the total cost may be in blood and money? The American people have been told nothing about these two problems.

If this is a proposition to stop Soviet expansion in Europe, \$400,000,000 is a mere drop in the bucket, and when the demands of all other nations—if this program is embarked upon—have been met, the cost will not be hundreds of millions but many billions of dollars. If

it is not to stop Russia, then we are embarking upon a course repugnant to every American tradition. Our reward will be the hatred and the enmity of those we seek to help. Finally, we will have to pay all the costs and do all the fighting, whether we stop Russia or not.

If we are going to stop Russia, what are we going to do about all the nations which are now behind the Stalin iron curtain—nations like Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, honest little Finland, Estonia, Russian-occupied Germany? The American people have been given no light on that question.

If we are going to make these loans to stop Russia, how much more are we going to have to lend to Great Britain? How many more billions are we to lend to France? How many more billions must we hand to Italy? How many more millions must we lend to China? What are we going to do about India? What are we going to do about Palestine?

To embark upon this program, even though we do not engage in war in the next 15 or 20 years, means the maintenance by the United States of America of a national defense stronger than that of any other war machine in the world, at an expense which would constitute a further crushing burden on our taxpayers for the next 10 generations. The administration has given us no light on that problem.

If we embark upon this new course, which constitutes a complete and radical departure from our traditional American policy, and furthermore, an abandonment of the Monroe Doctrine, are we prepared to finance all the countries of the world? Are we prepared to police with troops all the countries we would have to subjugate? On these grave questions the administration gives us no light.

If we embark upon this course, we will either hand over more multiplied billions of our money in gifts—they are not loans—to be administered by foreigners with the result that large portions of these hard-earned billions will be stolen, and that other portions will go to finance Soviet puppet governments in satellite states as has already been the case with UNRRA. Either this, or else we will have to police with special commissions of Americans, both military and civil, the expenditure of these billions in such countries. If we do that, then we shall have adopted the British colonial policy and an imperialistic technique whether we like it or whether we do not. The administration has given us no light on that subject.

Are we going to have to maintain a great standing Army, an extensive Navy, manned by American boys and girls under compulsory military service, in order to provide troops constantly to police the rest of the world while we shell out the money? The administration has given us no light on that subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, of course, but I told several of our people that I thought the Committee was

going to rise around 5:30. I spoke to the Speaker. I have not yet spoken to the majority leader or the Chairman of the Committee. I wonder what the majority leader would think about that.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAYBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. We tried to get some limitation on the debate simply for the purpose of determining how many wanted to speak. It was indicated that we might run as long as 70 minutes, and on that we concluded to go along and see what might develop. There are different opinions as to whether we might proceed to vote on this amendment if the time could be shortly concluded, but if it cannot, then certainly there should be no reason to hold the Committee late tonight, because I propose to have the Committee come in at 10 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. RAYBURN. I think it would be a merciful thing that, when the gentleman from Michigan completes his 5 minutes, the Committee might rise.

Mr. HALLECK. I wonder if, pending that, we could reach an agreement on how many more want to speak.

Mr. RAYBURN. There were 14 a while ago.

Mr. BLOOM. There are three on this side that are not here at the moment.

Mr. HALLECK. Of course, the matter is under the control of the Chairman of the Committee, but if he sees fit to have the Committee rise at the conclusion of the speech by the gentleman from Michigan, certainly that would meet with my approval.

Mr. RAYBURN. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Chairman, whatever the answer to these questions may be, I feel very deeply that the American people should be given at least all possible information, if not definite answers, before we, their representatives, are asked to vote to commit our Nation to this course.

Before taking this step, I believe we should again look at the money we ladled out in lend-lease while we sent our millions of troops into the Atlantic, the Mediterranean, and the Pacific theaters of war, from which hundreds of thousands of them never returned.

I think we should remind the American people that previous experience tells us that these so-called loans are not loans at all: they are gifts. I think, furthermore, Mr. Chairman, the American people ought to be reminded that these loans are not just pieces of paper; they are not merely disks of metal. They represent our raw materials, which are rapidly disappearing; they represent the wealth, the real wealth; they represent the toil and sweat and the energy, the very lifeblood of our American economic structure and of our American citizens: goods and services, manufactured goods, toil and sweat and energy and wealth pouring out of this country, never to return.

How long can the American people endure this constant drain upon their resources? The administration has given us no hint of the answer to that momentous question.

Mr. Chairman, how long can one hundred and thirty or one hundred and forty million Americans labor and sweat to feed the hungry peoples of the rest of the world, to rebuild shattered agriculture and the shattered industry of the other nations of the world? Is there not a grave danger that, instead of rescuing the rest of the world from starvation and ruin, we may so deplete our financial and material resources that we will go down to ruin and chaos with them? The administration gives us no light on this question.

Every economist in this country knows that the great depression of the 1930's was an aftermath of the First World War. The billions of dollars and the loans and expenditures which we made in that war and after that war were not repaid. These debts will never be repaid. Those loans represented goods, raw materials, energy, sweat, and toil, and they took so much of the lifeblood out of our American economy that, when the European nations repudiated their debts, our economy was prostrated by exhaustion.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is the time when we should review the costs in money we have already poured out—the billions, yes, the hundreds of billions, we have already spent in foreign wars. I, therefore, shall include as a part of my remarks a statement from the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945, showing the amounts foreign nations still owe the United States from World War I. That amount in the aggregate is \$14,000,000,000. Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a statement showing how the expenditures of \$50,500,000,000 given away by the United States in lend-lease was apportioned between nations.

Next, I desire to insert in the RECORD a short statement showing how the United States settled lend-lease at an 89-percent loss.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to insert in the RECORD also a statement showing the quotas for the International Monetary Fund for the countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference.

Following that, I desire to insert an article from the Washington Post of yesterday, May 7, 1947, showing that the United States is the only nation permitting the World Bank to lend its money while the other nations that agreed to put money into the World Bank have not done so.

Next, Mr. Chairman, I wish to insert a statement showing how the International Monetary Fund functions. The administration has given us no information lately on the condition of this fund. The American people are entitled to know what has happened to the \$2,750,000,000 we have put into that Fund.

Next I desire to insert in the RECORD a table showing the countries which received aid from UNRRA. I also desire to insert in the RECORD a short article showing how Americans have made generous

contributions to foreign peoples even outside of UNRRA.

I now want to introduce a statement showing as of March 8, 1946, how many foreign assets other nations possessed in the United States—and they run into the billions—while we are being besieged with demands and pleas for loans and for charity by almost every government in the world.

I wish to call attention to the fact that on Sunday, March 30, 1947, an article in the Times-Herald, under the signature of Lloyd Norman, showed that we have outstanding, outside of lend-lease, \$9,280,000,000 in loans to 58 foreign countries.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I wish to close my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article entitled "Where's the Money Coming From?"

This information should reach the people of the United States, because it is the citizens of this country who will have to do the fighting and the dying, as well as the paying, if there is another war. Our people, for generations to come, must do the paying for all this even though there is never another war.

Mr. Chairman, I feel I cannot vote for this proposition and be faithful to my solemn oath of office.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of December 11, 1945]

FOREIGN NATIONS STILL OWE UNITED STATES FOURTEEN BILLION FROM WORLD WAR I— THIS DEBT WILL NEVER BE PAID

Foreign countries still owed the United States \$14,791,340,307 in World War I debts on July 1, 1945, the Treasury said yesterday. "Total indebtedness" includes unpaid principal, interest postponed and payable under moratorium agreements, and interest accrued and unpaid under the agreements.

The United States has forgiven no World War I debts.

The following table includes total payments, by countries, of principal and interest on the debts. The debts of Russia and Armenia were not funded, however.

Country	Total indebtedness	Principal paid	Interest paid
Armenia.....	\$27,391,079		
Belgium.....	503,579,077	\$19,157,630	\$33,033,642
Czechoslovakia..	175,072,336	19,829,914	304,178
Estonia.....	24,491,700		1,248,431
Finland.....	8,574,063	1,157,868	5,847,626
France.....	4,006,635,664	226,039,588	260,036,302
Germany (Austrian debt).....	26,024,539	862,668	
Great Britain....	6,415,664,782	434,181,641	1,590,667,175
Greece.....	36,873,535	983,922	3,143,133
Hungary.....	2,740,938	73,955	482,924
Italy.....	2,052,213,408	37,464,319	3,365,560
Latvia.....	10,114,980	9,200	752,349
Lithuania.....	9,064,140	234,783	1,003,172
Poland.....	306,497,824	1,287,297	21,359,000
Romania.....	74,926,280	4,498,632	292,374
Russia.....	448,079,238		8,750,312
Yugoslavia.....	63,396,719	1,952,000	636,059

[From the Washington Times-Herald of November 16, 1946]

FIFTY AND FIVE-TENTHS BILLIONS SPENT BY UNITED STATES IN LEND-LEASE (Verbatim excerpts)

The extent to which the United States shouldered the production burden of World War II was made evident * * * in a Treasury Department report revealing the grand total of lend-lease as \$50,596,698,000.

In reverse lend-lease the United States received a total of \$7,000,387,000.

* * * the British Empire and Soviet Russia were the principal beneficiaries of America's aid.

A total of \$31,367,559,000 worth of the weapons and tools of war went to the British Empire, and lend-lease assistance to Russia totaled \$11,266,642,000.

The United States received from the British Empire in reverse lend-lease a total of \$6,319,792,000, and from Russia a total of \$2,212,000.

The report covers lend-lease operations from March 11, 1941, through August 31, 1946.

Besides the British Empire and Russia, top recipients of American weapons, supplies and services were:

France and possessions.....	\$3,230,660,000
China.....	1,557,399,000
Netherlands and possessions..	246,000,000
Belgium.....	153,235,000
Greece.....	71,526,000
Norway.....	52,216,000
Yugoslavia.....	32,027,000

The American Republics received a total of \$459,410,000, Brazil being the No. 1 recipient with a total of \$332,919,000.

Aid to the British Empire included more than \$3,000,000,000 worth of ordnance and ordnance stores, \$6,000,000,000 worth of aircraft and aeronautical matériel, \$3,000,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, \$5,000,000,000 worth of ships, and \$2,000,000,000 worth of miscellaneous military equipment.

Russia received more than \$1,569,000,000 worth of aircraft and air equipment, \$1,770,000,000 worth of tanks and other vehicles, \$1,256,000,000 worth of ships, and \$789,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

Over all, the United States sent to its allies \$8,559,000,000 worth of aircraft and air matériel, \$7,044,000,000 worth of shipping, \$6,327,000,000 in tanks and other vehicles, and \$4,382,000,000 in ordnance and ordnance stores.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

UNITED STATES SETTLED LEND-LEASE AT 89 PERCENT LOSS (By Jack Doherty) (Verbatim excerpts)

A Senate committee probe of the Anglo-American \$650,000,000 lend-lease settlement began * * * with revelation we are getting back less than 11 cents on a dollar and with charges that United States methods of surplus-property disposal abroad are contributing to a system of cartels.

Senator FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan, told the Senate War Investigating Subcommittee that the settlement turned over to the British Government at cut prices stores of goods which the British could then dispose of at a profit.

FERGUSON and Senator Mead, Democrat, of New York, pointed out that Great Britain had forbidden direct sales to Britons of surplus property by the United States, even though the goods were located in the British Isles. This left the British Government the only practical customer for surplus goods and strengthened British bargaining power, they charged.

Subcommittee Chairman Tunnell, Democrat, of Delaware, said in an opening statement that the writing off by this Nation of the \$6,021,164,850 British lend-lease account for \$650,000,000 will probably set a pattern for settlements with other nations whether we like it or not.

He produced figures showing that with the settlement now an accomplished fact, the United States settled for 8½ cents on the dollar for unconsumed lend-lease stocks worth \$5,552,144,850.

The United Kingdom also received \$351,000,000 worth of surplus property which was still in the possession of American forces there, Tunnell said. This part of the account was settled for 17 cents on the dollar.

The third part of lend-lease settlement was on goods in the pipe line at the end of the war, for which Great Britain agreed to pay \$118,000,000 of a balance of \$118,020,000.

Quotas for International Monetary Fund for countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia.....	200
Belgium.....	225
Bolivia.....	10
Brazil.....	150
Canada.....	300
Chile.....	50
China.....	550
Colombia.....	50
Costa Rica.....	5
Cuba.....	50
Czechoslovakia.....	125
Denmark.....	(¹)
Dominican Republic.....	5
Ecuador.....	5
Egypt.....	45
El Salvador.....	2.5
Ethiopia.....	6
France.....	450
Greece.....	40
Guatemala.....	5
Haiti.....	5
Honduras.....	2.5
Iceland.....	1
India.....	400
Iran.....	25
Iraq.....	8
Liberia.....	.5
Luxemburg.....	10
Mexico.....	90
Netherlands.....	275
New Zealand.....	50
Nicaragua.....	2
Norway.....	50
Panama.....	.5
Paraguay.....	2
Peru.....	25
Philippine Commonwealth.....	15
Poland.....	125
Union of South Africa.....	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics..	1,200
United Kingdom.....	1,300
United States.....	2,750
Uruguay.....	15
Venezuela.....	15
Yugoslavia.....	60

Total..... 8,800

¹ The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the fund after the Danish Government has declared its readiness to sign the agreement but before signature takes place.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, page 546.

Subscriptions to the Bank for Reconstruction and Development allocated to countries represented at the Bretton Woods Conference

[In millions of United States dollars]

Australia.....	200
Belgium.....	225
Bolivia.....	7
Brazil.....	105
Canada.....	325
Chile.....	35
China.....	600
Colombia.....	35
Costa Rica.....	2
Cuba.....	35
Czechoslovakia.....	125
Denmark.....	(¹)
Dominican Republic.....	2
Ecuador.....	3.2
Egypt.....	40
El Salvador.....	1
Ethiopia.....	3
France.....	450
Greece.....	25
Guatemala.....	2
Haiti.....	2
Honduras.....	1
Iceland.....	1
India.....	400
Iran.....	24

Iraq.....	6
Liberia.....	.5
Luxemburg.....	10
Mexico.....	65
Netherlands.....	275
New Zealand.....	50
Nicaragua.....	.8
Norway.....	50
Panama.....	.2
Paraguay.....	.8
Peru.....	17.5
Philippine Commonwealth.....	15
Poland.....	125
Union of South Africa.....	100
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.....	1,200
United Kingdom.....	1,300
United States.....	8,175
Uruguay.....	10.5
Venezuela.....	10.5
Yugoslavia.....	40

Total..... 9,100

¹The quota of Denmark shall be determined by the Bank after Denmark accepts membership in accordance with the Articles of Agreement.

Source: Department of State Bulletin, Nov. 5, 1944, p. 550.

[From the United States News of July 6, 1945]

HOW THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND WILL FUNCTION

1. Forty-five nations pour \$3,800,000,000 in gold and various currencies into the Fund. United States puts in \$2,750,000,000 in dollars; Britain, \$1,300,000,000 in pounds; Russia, \$1,200,000,000 in rubles, and so forth. All put in some gold.

2. Nations then get together to decide what each currency is worth. Dollar must be valued at \$35 an ounce for gold. Pound is likely to be \$4.03; Canadian dollar, 91 cents. Values will be determined by agreement between Fund and members.

3. Members then agree to stop using money to regulate trade, to abandon currency warfare. They have 3 years to make adjustments, and, after 5 years, currency controls are supposed to be removed.

4. World trade resumes. A British importer wants to buy United States automobiles. He gets his bank to buy dollars with British pounds, so he can pay the United States factory for the shipment.

5. But many British importers may clamor for dollars, more dollars than England has. Then England goes to the Fund to buy dollars with more pounds. She can buy \$325,000,000 a year—one-fourth of her total original contribution in pounds.

6. England cannot buy dollars from the Fund, however, without using some of her own gold and dollar reserves. The agreement is that, for each dollar bought from the Fund, England will use another dollar out of her own reserve.

7. Also, if British sales in the next year produce a surplus of dollars or gold, half of the increase must be given to the Fund in exchange for the Fund's pounds. This need not be done unless Britain's own reserves exceed her Fund quota.

8. Fund levies a service charge of three-fourths of 1 percent of the amount of dollars bought. After 3 months, interest begins at one-half of 1 percent a year for 9 months, and steps up to 4 percent after 4 years. Meanwhile, Fund will try to correct British trade balances.

9. Before Britain buys too many dollars from the Fund, however, she will want to lower the value of the pound so as to make British goods cheaper and increase sales in world markets. She can lower the pound as much as 10 percent—to \$3.63—after consulting the Fund.

10. If this doesn't correct the situation, the Fund can allow England to reduce the pound still more. But England can't make

the cut unless the Fund approves, and the Fund can approve only if a cheaper pound is considered necessary.

11. Finally, all countries may be like Britain in this example and rush to buy dollars. That would make dollars scarce in the Fund. The Fund then can ration United States currency among members, and members then can act to protect their own dollar reserves.

12. The trade of each country is supposed to balance over a period of years, which will bring a balance in Fund accounts. If this doesn't happen, the International Bank will make long-term stabilization loans to reach a balance.

[From the Washington Post of May 7, 1947]
UNITED STATES ONLY NATION THAT LETS WORLD BANK LEND ITS MONEY

United States alone among the 44 nations in the World Bank has agreed to let the bank use its subscription payment to lend to other nations, an authoritative source said yesterday.

The other 43 say they are not in a position now to have their currencies lent out to other nations. This hold-back was described as unimportant at this particular time, however, since none of the nine members asking \$2,553,875,000 in loans wants anything but United States dollars.

The bank's stock of subscribed dollars will be only \$721,392,500, even after the United States finishes its subscription payments 3 weeks from now. The only way the bank can add to them in the near future is to get dollars from private American investors.

The bank is preparing now to borrow from these investors, so it will have more to lend to members, by selling—probably sometime this summer or fall—its own bonds in this country, in denominations as small as \$1,000.

FRANCE FIRST IN LINE

Before then, and probably this month or next, the bank is expected to begin making loans out of its subscribed capital.

France is reported in informed quarters to be first in line for a loan, although it is more likely to be \$200,000,000 than the \$500,000,000 she applied for. Denmark, which wants \$50,000,000, is described as due for a loan soon also.

The hold-back by virtually all members in permitting the bank to lend their currencies does not greatly worry officials of the bank, well-posted sources say, because the officials hope their permission will be given by the time their money is wanted.

The hold-back is attributed to the fact that many of the members were hard hit by the war and, at a time when they feel they must borrow to stage an economic comeback, they also feel they are in no position to put out money to lend.

NOT READY TO EXPORT

When a nation's money is lent out, it serves as a sort of ticket to buy in that country, and the hold-back members are said also to take the position that they aren't yet able to produce enough goods to sell freely for export.

Hold-backs in permitting the loan of subscribed funds are authorized for members under terms of the Bretton Woods agreement under which the bank and its twin, the World Monetary Fund, were organized a little over a year ago.

Members can hold back on that part of their subscriptions put up in their currencies, but not on the 2 percent of subscriptions they were required to pay in gold or United States dollars.

[From the New York Times of October 28, 1946]

TABLE OF UNRRA AID (Verbatim excerpts)

Following are tables from a report of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration. They break down the amount and kind of assistance furnished each of the principal beneficiaries:

Shipments program through Dec. 31, 1946, in thousands of tons

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear ¹	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation ²	Unclassified ³	Total
Greece.....	1,306	27	9	287	693	727	3,049
Yugoslavia.....	1,084	73	20	161	695	352	2,385
Poland.....	67	3	2	17	42	25	153
Do.....	806	80	27	386	493	-----	1,792
Czechoslovakia.....	608	40	24	267	404	-----	1,343
Italy.....	1,844	105	14	410	7,238	-----	9,611
Austria.....	365	4	1	164	47	177	753
White Russia.....	72	6	1	44	22	-----	145
Ukraine.....	209	19	2	41	112	-----	383
China.....	1,094	155	37	558	907	-----	2,751
Other programs.....	57	90	5	6	4	34	193
Total.....	7,512	602	142	2,341	10,657	1,315	22,569

¹ Includes textile raw materials.

² Includes coal and all raw materials except textile raw materials.

³ Military shipments and items awaiting specification.

Shipment program through Dec. 31, 1946, in millions of dollars

	Food	Clothing, textiles, and footwear ¹	Medical and sanitation	Agricultural rehabilitation	Industrial rehabilitation ²	Unclassified	Grand total
Greece.....	164.0	35.0	10.3	50.8	40.9	57.0	358.0
Yugoslavia.....	139.6	75.9	21.6	40.0	109.4	43.0	429.5
Albania.....	5.5	5.4	1.9	6.6	7.1	2.0	28.5
Poland.....	180.5	84.5	30.0	80.0	99.0	-----	474.0
Czechoslovakia.....	107.0	29.5	26.5	33.4	73.6	-----	270.0
Italy.....	195.7	55.9	16.0	29.5	127.4	.5	425.0
Austria.....	54.0	2.0	1.5	19.1	9.0	31.7	117.3
White Russia.....	28.9	7.4	1.2	5.7	17.8	-----	61.0
Ukraine.....	100.2	21.7	2.8	17.4	46.9	-----	189.0
China.....	131.5	95.9	41.3	80.0	186.3	-----	535.0
Other programs.....	14.3	23.0	2.5	1.0	2.5	15.1	58.3
Total.....	1,112.2	436.2	155.6	363.5	719.9	149.3	2,945.6

¹ Values, f. a. s.

² Includes textile raw materials.

[From the Washington Daily News of October 11, 1946]

AMERICANS GENEROUS EVEN OUTSIDE UNRRA

(By Robert Taylor)

Verbatim excerpts

United States citizens have contributed out of their pockets, for foreign relief, one-third as much as their Government invested in the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.

The figure you most often see is the \$2,700,000,000 which the United States put into UNRRA's treasury—three-fourths of the total UNRRA budget.

The one you don't hear about is the \$925,000,000 for voluntary contributions from September 1939 until this spring.

At the time the President's War Relief Control Board quit business last March 31, 596 private agencies which had registered for foreign war relief had collected funds and supplies amounting to \$597,621,366.

UNRRA received another \$150,000,000 in voluntary contributions.

In addition, the American Red Cross dispensed \$32,000,000 for emergency civilian war relief in foreign countries between September 1939 and last June.

Also, the Red Cross handled distribution of another \$146,000,000 for other agencies, most of it coming out of allocations of Federal funds and material.

The resulting total of more than \$900,000,000 is greater than the amount all other nations contributed to UNRRA.

Heaviest collections in the voluntary aid campaign were by the American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, \$48,840,231; United China Relief reported \$40,316,755; United Palestine Appeal, \$32,511,604; and American Society for Russian Relief, \$27,707,859.

In 1939, Polish relief ranked highest; in 1940, 1941, 1942, British; in 1943, Russian, and in 1944 and 1945 international causes got two-thirds of all contributions.

Since the War Relief Control Board ended, the State Department, at the request of President Truman, has maintained a Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid. Private foreign aid groups may register voluntarily with this committee, providing they agree to file their programs, budgets and audits.

[From the Washington Times-Herald of February 23, 1946]

FOREIGN-OWNED ASSETS IN UNITED STATES TOP THIRTEEN BILLIONS, TREASURY SAYS

(By Walter Trohan)

Foreign-owned assets in the United States totaled almost \$13,000,000,000 on June 14, 1941, and most of these assets are not only intact, but have greatly increased in value since that date.

This was disclosed . . . by the Treasury Department with the publication of a census taken by the Department's Foreign Funds Control Division. The census data will be used in unfreezing foreign-owned assets over which the division exercised wartime supervision.

The gross total of all foreign-owned assets in the United States as of the census date was \$12,739,000,000. Included were such assets as deposits in American banks, investments in American securities and enterprises, interests in securities and trusts, real estate and other types of property.

Ownership in these assets was vested in 160,000 sources—individuals, partnerships, corporations and governments. These are spread over every country in the world.

The Treasury Department estimated that the foreign-owned assets have increased in value to approximately \$14,000,000,000 from 1941 to December 31, 1944, exclusive of gold earmarked for foreign account. Earmarked gold more than doubled in that period going from \$1,916,000,000 to \$3,937,000,000. The

total of foreign assets and gold as of December 1944 was approximately \$18,000,000,000.

Foreign deposits in the United States rose by \$373,000,000 and stood at \$4,031,000,000 as of December 31, 1944. In addition, foreign countries purchased more than \$1,500,000,000 of United States bonds between 1941 and 1944. The Treasury said changes in foreign holdings of long-term assets could not be determined easily, but it was estimated that net foreign purchases were 120 millions from 1941 to 1944.

Enemy-owned assets totaled \$519,000,000. Of this Germany owned \$198,000,000; Japan, \$160,000,000; and Italy, \$130,000,000.

Of the total of almost thirteen billions of foreign-owned assets, five billion three hundred fifty-two and four-tenths millions are charged in the census to the British Empire.

Of the British total, three billion two hundred and thirty-eight and nine-tenths millions is charged to the United Kingdom.

The foreign-owned assets charged to the United Kingdom included \$281,000,000 in bullion, currency, and deposits. The British own \$441,000,000 in American securities, hold \$677,600,000 in enterprises and \$1,441,600 in miscellaneous assets. . . . The French empire owns \$1,081,000,000 of American assets.

Canada, next to the United Kingdom, is the largest holder of American assets at \$1,742,800,000. Next is Switzerland with \$1,210,600,000, and next is the Dutch Empire with \$1,164,700,000.

Soviet Russia owned only \$28,100,000 of American assets.

"WHERE'S THE MONEY COMING FROM?"

(Digest of an article in the January 1944 Monthly Bulletin of the National City Bank of New York, discussing a new book carrying the title headlined above, by Stuart Chase)

(Verbatim extracts)

Mr. Chase gives full support to the "owing it to ourselves" argument about internal debt, and plumps unreservedly for the theory of the compensatory economy—that is, where the Government takes responsibility for maintaining full employment by spending freely and running into debt in periods of depression, and siphoning off purchasing power and retiring debt by taxes in periods of boom.

The war has demonstrated, Mr. Chase argues, that the country can, if it only makes up its mind to do so, lift employment payrolls, and production to peak levels. (The trouble with pump-priming in the 'thirties, he says, was that the Government never spent enough.) After seeing that the Government can spend money all out and put people to work for war, Americans, he observes, are going to be hard to convince that the Government cannot do the same for peace.

Discussing in his new book the question where the money to support Government spending is coming from Mr. Chase says:

"The question of where's the money coming from has one answer in the case of the individual, and quite a different answer in the case of all individuals united in a Nation. . . . If you have no money, you cannot buy that beautiful new car. Period. But if you, and all your fellow citizens, want to buy a beautiful new river development project or a beautiful new war, there is nothing to stop you from doing so. . . .

"In your collective capacity you can put men and machines hitherto idle to work. When this pool is exhausted, you can transfer manpower from making cars to making tanks. You can issue claim checks (money) for the new war production, and then tax them back or borrow them back in a closed circuit. You

can buy your war and its costly equipment right up to the limit of the nation's manpower, machine-hours, and materials. There will be no difficulty about the money. . . .

"Except for our fears and financial traditions, the same formula can be followed in peacetime."

Analyzing this argument, it will be seen that it comes down basically to the same philosophy as that embodied in the statement that we need not worry about a national debt that is "owed to ourselves."

In the passage cited above, the author appears to assume a smooth, almost automatic, flow of funds from the Treasury through the processes of production and distribution and back to the Treasury by way of taxes. . . .

This argument is obviously similar to the National Resources Planning Board proposition that "costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield." . . . The process sounds easy and simple; the difficulty is that funds do not flow from the Treasury into the economy and back to the Treasury in the smooth and automatic way that is suggested. . . . It is generally recognized that government spending means either bigger and bigger deficits or higher and higher taxes.

This raises the exceedingly knotty problem of who is going to pay the taxes. . . .

In other words, the formula for where's the money coming from appears on analysis to be less simple than it sounds. Evidently there are reasons other than mere fears and financial traditions to be considered. Discussing the thesis that government spending and building up of debt need occasion no concern because the money spent or paid out in debt interest remains within the system, Dr. Albert Hahn, former chairman of a large provincial bank in Frankfurt-on-the-Main, Germany, writing in the Banking Law Journal for July 1943, points to some interesting similarity with arguments circulated in Germany during and following the First World War. He says:

"To everyone who lived through the German inflation, this argument arouses strong, but very unpleasant, memories, for it is obviously identical with the dictum formulated in Germany during the First World War, 'The money remains in the country.' This dictum provided the solace to the conscience of German authorities as they followed the lax fiscal policies which resulted in inflation and the misery that came in its wake.

"But what of the statement itself? Is it true? It is not only true—it is too true. It is a truism like the arithmetical equation that 10 minus 10 equals 0. This argument, of course, can be applied at whatever level of government debt one might choose to mention, anywhere from \$1 to trillions and trillions."

The theory of the compensatory budget or compensatory economy, as Mr. Chase puts it, has gained a wide following over the past decade. . . . It represents a mixture of economic defeatism born of hard times, and of an exhilarating sense of having discovered something new from the experience of seeing at last what really big-scale government spending can do. . . . All . . . share in common the view that it is the government's job to keep the economy operating on even keel at full employment, injecting purchasing power into the system by increased public spending and investment as private spending and investment falls off, and following a reverse course as the cycle changes. Implementing government spending, Mr. Chase advocates a highly flexible tax system—one designed to penalize idle money and drive hoarded savings into spending or investment when the economy needs stimulating, with a shift over to some form of spending taxes when things begin to go too fast and need restraint.

Admittedly, here is a very interesting blueprint for permanent prosperity—if it would

work. Actually, it is difficult—even with the most sanguine stretch of the imagination—to see how it could work.

In the first place, it is impossible to turn public expenditures and taxes on and off like the spigot of a water pipe. Much less is it easy to alter on short notice the structure of the tax system at the behest of economic planners bent on using it as the lever to control business cycle fluctuations.

While it is usually easy enough to expand Government expenditures—appropriation bills are almost invariably popular—it is quite another matter to contract them. . . . The result is that every period of big spending leaves the Government on a permanently higher level of costs, with more debt and more taxes. . . .

And comparable difficulties arise as to taxes. While plenty of people like to see Government expenditures increased, nobody really like to see taxes go up. . . . Despite the most compelling reasons for tax increases in wartime, both to pay for the war and to sterilize surplus purchasing power, we have witnessed the spectacle of months of wrangling over tax bills; and not even yet have we a tax program that is truly anti-inflationary in the sense of going to the heart of the problem of reaching excess income where it is being created. . . . Politics has dominated. . . .

If we are unable or unwilling to tax adequately in wartime, when the need is so clear and when there is a spirit of patriotism to help, what chance would there be in ordinary times of raising taxes on large masses of people to cut off a perfectly good boom which everyone was enjoying and would doubtless like to see continue indefinitely?

Mr. John Chamberlain, literary critic of the New York Times, expressed the difficulty very well when, in reviewing Mr. Chase's book, "Where's the Money Coming From," he said:

"What bothers me is the failure of people to see the implications of Mr. Chase's ideas. If there is to be deficit financing in a 1933-39 period, there must be high taxation in a 1940-43 period, when the economy is booming. Yet Congress, at the moment, shows no willingness to tax with any rigor. I suspect that this is an almost unchangeable fact of human nature, this unwillingness to pay off in good times what has been borrowed in bad times. When it's raining is obviously no time to mend the roof. But when the sun comes out we don't want to mend the roof either. Things are too pleasant on the ground."

Mr. Chase concedes in his book that his system would require a "serious psychological adjustment" about taxes. "Americans," he says, "traditionally regard taxes as a burden and a waste if not an outrage." But, says he, "If they want a compensatory economy and not something much more radical, they will have to change their ideas and begin to think about taxes the way they have been taught to think about insurance. You pay now in order to avoid calamity later."

Perhaps Americans ought to think about taxes that way; but will they? Maybe, before piling up a lot of debt on the compensatory spending theory, it would be a good idea to know.

A second, and even more basic, objection to the compensatory budget idea is that it vastly oversimplifies the problem of maintaining economic stability. It would be a fine thing indeed if all that was needed to keep the economic machine hitting on all cylinders at just the right pace would be turning on and off the stream of funds from the Public Treasury. But it would be well to pause and think a moment of the full implications of this doctrine.

What it means, first of all, is applying a single specific—Government spending—to all the ills to which the economic system may fall victim. . . .

What it means, secondly, is attempting to shift to the Government responsibilities that in a democratic society must rest primarily with the people. . . . Why should anyone worry when the Government underwrites everything? . . .

The fact is that society cannot function under a system that encourages irresponsibility and indiscipline, and which protects everyone from the consequences of making mistakes. . . . Necessity is the mother not only of invention but of adjustment. Except as there are incentives and pressures to eliminate sources of disorder, sore spots in the economy tend to get sorer and sorer, until finally the treatment breaks down. . . .

The argument that because we willingly pour out great sums to win a war we can do the same in peace is by no means original with Mr. Chase. . . .

It is true, as Mr. Chase says in the first quotation cited above, there will be no difficulty about raising the money. . . . The real question is, What are the consequences of this kind of finance? . . .

"Where did the money come from?" asks Mr. Chase, pointing to the vast military programs of Russia, Italy, Japan, and Germany. "Where did Britain and America get it for their colossal war outlays?"

We know the answer to that. They got it out of varying degrees of credit and currency inflation, coupled with taxation beyond anything ever dreamed of before and unprecedented regimentation of their people. . . .

When we hear it said that because this and other countries can "afford" to spend great sums for carrying on the war, we can "afford" to spend in peace, we have to bear in mind that the ultimate consequences of this war spending are not yet known. The chemist does not stop in the middle of his experiment and draw final conclusions as to the results. . . . It is a question of what the cost will be in terms of inflation, taxation, and the kind of an economy we are going to have.

In war, we spend money and run into debt, not because we can afford to . . . but because . . . almost nothing else matters. Even though we knew that the spending of these sums would eventually bring national bankruptcy and financial chaos, as it has done for many warring nations in the past, we would still do it. . . .

The economy in war is not and cannot be—at least in a democracy—a criterion for the economy in peace. War represents a tremendous distortion of normal peacetime values and practices and ways of living, and there is no warrant for assuming that because certain things are done in war they can be, or ought to be, done in peace. . . .

What has been said is not to imply that the Government should not give assistance in times of economic crisis. . . .

The main point to be stressed is that . . . we be thoroughly aware of what we are doing, and not mistake palliatives for cures. Real curative measures consist of making adjustments, discovering and eliminating bad policies and practices, cleaning up weak spots, and so forth, so that the economy can get a new start. When government spending comes to be used as a substitute for such essential—though often painful and unpleasant—processes, it becomes a menace instead of a help.

Nor should it be supposed that in taking the road of Government spending we are necessarily avoiding "something more radical," as suggested by Mr. Chase. Government spending tends to be like a drug, in that it takes larger and larger doses to get results; and all the time, debt and taxes get higher and higher. There is no surer route to statism than by the way of the tax collector, for when private enterprise ceases to become profitable and lags, the state takes over. One of the factors handicapping recovery in the

thirties was the draining off of the source of risk capital by taxation, together with the large slice of the profits of successful ventures taken by government. . . .

In going forward with whatever relief programs may be deemed necessary and desirable from time to time, let us do so with eyes open to the limitations and dangers of such measures. Let us not be misled by any assumption that "because we did it in war we can do it in peace," or delude ourselves that we can keep ourselves afloat by pumping out Government money for all sorts of projects, and increasing debt, so long as "the money remains in the country," and "we owe the debt to ourselves."

Mr. EATON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2616) to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point an amendment to the pending bill which I propose to offer tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The amendment referred to is as follows:

Page 4, line 22, after the period add a new section as follows:

"Sec. 3a. There is hereby created the Foreign Funds Control Commission which shall be an independent agency of Government directly responsible to the Congress.

"The Commission shall consist of three members—a Director, the Comptroller General, and the Secretary of the Treasury.

"The Director shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate for a term of 5 years and shall serve until his successor has qualified. The Director's salary shall be \$15,000 annually. He shall be a natural-born citizen of the United States. He shall have had a broad experience in the administration of Government funds and without previous prominent affiliation with any major political party.

"The Commission is hereby directed to administer all funds hereafter granted by the Treasury of the United States or previous grants if directed by the Congress to foreign countries, their nationals and agencies of whatever kind or nature.

"The work of the Commission shall be organized under no less than three general divisions (1) the executive under the supervision of the Director, (2) audit and accounting under the supervision of the Comptroller General, and (3) investigation under the supervision of the Intelligence Branch of the Treasury.

"The Director is hereby authorized to engage such personnel, to acquire such office equipment, accounting records, printed matter, and office supplies as may be required to effectuate the purposes of this act.

"The Director shall have the assistance of other Government departments such as the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Mines and Mining, Bureau of Fisheries, State, War, Navy, Treasury on matters generally coming within the scope of the respective department's functions and to the end that the best expert advice obtainable may be at the service of the Commission in administering the funds so granted; and it shall be the duty of the said agencies to cooperate in every practical manner possible.

"The main office of the Commission shall be located in Washington, D. C. Field offices shall be established and operated in whatever country is given a grant and shall be maintained in operation in that country for whatever time may be required to properly administer the funds so granted.

"The Commission shall submit quarterly reports of its administration to the Congress which shall be published for the general information of the taxpayers and bond buyers of the United States."

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, our very able and outstanding colleague the Honorable JOHN TABER, a Representative from New York and chairman of the Appropriations Committee, has been very highly commended by Arthur Krock in an article which appeared in the New York Times on May 6, 1947. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point Mr. Krock's article:

TABER'S TASK UNPOPULAR—CONGRESS ECONOMIZER IS TARGET OF MANY, AS WERE HOLMAN AND MANN EARLIER

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—The way of the transgressor is a primrose path compared to that an economizer in Congress must tread, and Representative JOHN TABER, of Auburn, N. Y., provides the most prominent current illustration of that fact.

As chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, he suggests a Pilgrim father in the savage wilderness as he strives to check and reduce the ever-growing costs of government, for every time he swings his axe in the Federal fiscal forest he is the target of arrows from all directions. But they seem to bounce off him harmlessly, as far as diverting him from his purpose is concerned.

At the moment Mr. TABER is under fire from marksmen of all sorts as he seeks to lop off or cut down this appropriation or that. The aim of some is as good as their individual objectives, when the latter are considered separately from the general retrenchment program with which Mr. TABER is firmly dealing. The aim of others is not so good, and their causes are motivated by self-interest or an exaggerated idea of the importance to the Nation of the Federal project they are trying to save from the chairman's axe. But this is always the case when any real attempt is made to retrench Government spending.

Groups of the general public are interested in protecting various Federal activities from abolition or sharp reduction through the use of the appropriating power of Congress. But Mr. TABER is certain that the public as a whole wants billions sliced from the President's budget of \$37,500,000,000 and will approve this result without too much concern over details. He does not, however, expect to become a popular figure in Congress or outside it—watchdogs of the Treasury never do. He does not look for any official rewards or promotions—watchdogs of the Treasury rarely attain them. But he does not seem to mind.

In this respect Mr. TABER resembles two other Treasury watchdogs who served in the House and were successful defenders of the funds supplied by public revenue. One was

William S. Holman, of Indiana, the other was James R. Mann, of Illinois, and both, like the Representative from Auburn, were members of the Committee on Appropriations.

Holman, who was elected by his rural Indiana district to Congress 16 times in 40 years, was born on that frontier in 1822 and as a Jeffersonian Democrat applied himself to project the Virginia statesman's ideas into the industrial age that succeeded the agricultural. A historian records that, in Holman's view, most people were poor and highly taxed; Federal spending benefited those who least needed help; one outlay bred another, and in the end swollen bureaucracy would destroy democratic institutions. To save money he even opposed expanding the Library of Congress and improving the Capital City, for when economy becomes a legislator's main purpose in life he often fells a tree in trying to clear out the underbrush. But Holman's struggle against waste, extravagance, and purely political spending saved hundreds of millions to the taxpayers.

Mann was a later figure in congressional history; he lived until 1922 and he served a Chicago district from 1897 until he died. He had a hand in railroad regulation, the pure food and drug law, measures to restrict corporate abuses and the White Slave Act that bears his name. But it was as Speaker Cannon's agent, and then as minority leader, in blocking loose, extravagant, or otherwise bad legislation that his great public service was performed. Much in this category died at his hands, because of his ability, the consequence of incessant study, to find the weak spots in bills, and the amount of money he saved the American people cannot be estimated.

Mr. TABER is taller and more portly than these earlier watchdogs but he has the same grim expression and saw-edged voice that goes with it. He looks and dresses like a banker-farmer, doesn't talk off his own particular subjects, runs his committee with a hard hand, takes little interest in the party line except when on appropriations he draws it, and is the terror of all bureaucrats. Their fear of him is as great as his distrust of them, for between him and them it must be continuous war to the knife if he is to enforce real economies in Federal spending.

The New Yorker will reduce the budget effectively if that can be done by any leader in Congress over the massed and shifting opposition this effort always encounters. Those who support his general objective are constantly breaking away in favor of some particular project, but he realizes that every time he yields to one such group he will have less influence in combating the next. Therefore, some good enterprises will suffer with the bad at Mr. TABER's hands.

But if there are to be any important cuts in Federal spending, this consequence is inevitable under the present system—until or unless a President comes along who will really take the lead in economy and real budget reform.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, during the last campaign the Republican Party made 10 campaign pledges. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a magazine article showing how those pledges are being definitely and actively fulfilled.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a speech he recently made over radio station WHDH in Boston.

Mr. LANE asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include a report.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the State Department to me dated May 5, 1947, and also some telegrams to the Department of State from Ambassador Smith from Moscow to the Secretary of State dated June 11, 1946, which were referred to in debate today in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

Mrs. DOUGLAS asked and was given permission to extend her remarks in the RECORD in five instances and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEFEAT THE "WOOL GRAB" BILL

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, the most dangerous threat to the security of every American family is the steady and alarming increase in the cost of living.

Every household is worried about this problem.

As prices go up, up, outstripping incomes and leading us inevitably, unless checked, to that explosive point which is followed by business collapse, unemployment, and despair, Americans are anxiously wondering what we, their elected representatives, are doing to forestall disaster.

In the Congress this week there appears a bill, S. 814, already passed by the Senate and amended by the Agriculture Committee of the House, which will, if passed by the House, give spur to the inflationary menace.

The wool-price-support program is due to expire unless legislation is approved to extend it, but under the proposed bill, it will be extended and intensified to the point where the Government will lose, industry will suffer, and every consumer in the United States will pay through the nose.

Our domestic wool growers were never able to supply one-half of the raw-material needs of our manufacturers of worsted cloth. Furthermore, they could not supply them with the long-fiber raw wool necessary for quality worsteds. Even when given tariff protection, domestic sheep raisers cannot do the job.

But when they seek preferential treatment over all other agricultural commodities, as in this bill, it is time to call a halt. Wool needs some support, but no more than that given 160 other agricultural items, which is 90 percent—except cotton which is 92½—of parity for 1947-48. Parity is a Government index of farm-operation costs, similar to the cost-of-living index. The wool growers want 100 percent of parity.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Did I understand the gentleman to say that no other crops had a support of more than 90 percent?

Mr. LANE. I understand, with the exception of the one I mentioned, 92½ percent. I stand corrected if I am wrong.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that flax, for example, has a support price of 150 or 160 percent of parity. I think others can be found in that same category.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Why our extensive worsted industry and its workers, which suffered from substandard conditions for many years and only recently arrived at steady production, good wages, and good profits, should be asked to bear the burden is beyond all semblance of economic justice.

We believe that the Government has done more than enough for one segment of our economy—the wool growers. We cannot afford to keep on sending good money after bad. In spite of a 34 cents per pound tariff, foreign wool—and better wool—imported from 23 different countries, can still be sold at less than the support price which the Government is paying to wool growers in the United States. Uncle Sam is presently stuck with a 400,000,000 pound wool surplus which he can't get rid of. And he bought it at above-market prices. On this program, to date, he has lost over \$33,000,000 without counting the increased costs to consumers from artificially supported prices.

Now, through the proposed legislation, he is being asked to shell out another \$100,000,000 through indirect subsidies to wool farmers by outright Government purchase of the 1947 and 1948 wool production in the United States at the highest prices over a 27-year period.

As if this weren't enough, we are now being asked to give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to lay an additional import fee on foreign wool, over and above the 34 cents per pound tariff already levied. This new impost, up to 50 percent ad valorem, can be added at the discretion of the Secretary.

This is altogether too much power to give to any man, and especially at a time when so many other controls, justified only by the emergency of war, have been dropped. It amounts, in effect, to a nationalization of the raw-wool industry.

Clinton M. Hester, of the National Wool Trade Association, estimates that the subsidy "means a minimum of \$1 extra cost on at least 75,000,000 wool garments bought annually by Americans."

The imposition of these import fees would curtail wool imports, resulting in a contraction of manufacturing and a drop in employment, bringing sudden and severe deflation to many of our industrial communities.

This dangerous precedent could well open the door to high-tariff logrolling for other commodities, which, at the present crisis in the price structure, could plunge us headlong into a depression which would rock the foundations of our constitutional government.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANE. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I can see why the gentleman might feel it is unwise to start delegating power to the

members of the President's Cabinet, but I would like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that under section 22 of the AAA Act the President already has those powers that are in this particular bill. They have never been exercised by the President in that way, but he has the power at the present time.

Mr. LANE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Representatives of our State Department, at the Geneva Conference, are negotiating reciprocal trade agreements. There is a distinct possibility that these agreements will lower the tariff on woolen textile manufacturers.

In Massachusetts, the heart of our textile industry, the workers were, at one time, among the lowest paid group of industrial workers in the country. By dint of persistent efforts and cooperation among management and labor and government, we have built up this depressed industry to the point where it is turning out the finest fabrics in volume. The industry is showing a profit and is paying an average wage throughout of \$1.20 an hour, in keeping with the progressive standards of American enterprise. This contrasts sharply with the 35 cents per hour average in English textiles, and even lower wage rates elsewhere.

We cannot survive a double squeeze exerted by a lowered tariff permitting woolen products manufactured by other countries with cheap labor to compete in the home market, and jacked-up costs for the wool our industry needs, which will result from 100 percent parity on the domestic clip, plus increased import fees on the better wool we require, and get, from abroad.

Traders, industrialists, workers and consumers will fight S. 814, Report No. 257, until its final and well-merited defeat.

It is not that we are closing our eyes to the case for the domestic wool growers. In a spirit of compromise, fair to both sides, we recommend and will support a measure along the lines of the Herter bill.

This would give a Government guaranty of support to wool farmers at 90 percent of parity, equal to the support of other agricultural commodities. It would permit free-enterprise merchants to go on with the job of purchasing, storing, preparing, and distributing the domestic wool clip, as they have done successfully in the past. It would take the Government out of the wool business, where its performance has been a dismal failure during the postwar years of 1945 and 1946.

During that period, a huge stock pile was accumulated in spite of a record demand for wool. This was not due to foreign competition, because tariff protection amounted to 35 percent of the value of domestic wool. The workings of the parity law had no effect on the situation until late 1946. Poor judgment by the Government is alone responsible.

S. 814 would extend and aggravate the dangers to trade and industry. It would fix the price of wool for 2 years at over 100 percent of today's high parity, and could be 130 percent or more should parity drop to wartime levels, as is confidently expected. Under S. 814, losses

to the Government and the taxpayer would be enormous. It would stymie private enterprise and force the Government to be the only buyer of wool. And once the Government gets the wool, it cannot dispose of it except at a loss.

Such ill-advised legislation might well tip the scales of our whole economy from recovery to collapse. Once the chain reaction for preferential treatment sets in, it is hard to stop.

The American consumer is demanding that we do everything in our power to bring about a gradual reduction in prices.

Here is the test of our abilities and our intentions.

In the fight against inflation, the defeat of S. 814 is imperative.

REDUCTION AND CURTAILMENT OF POSTAL SERVICES

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have received reports from Members of Congress and from people all over the country inquiring about the reduction and curtailment of postal services. I have been advised that postal workers are reporting to the public that service is being curtailed as a result of economies being effected by the Eightieth Congress. In several instances, this is being developed into a partisan attack on the present majority in Congress.

I do not believe that this campaign was originated in the Post Office Department in Washington, for high officials of the service have advised me that the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill did not necessitate any curtailment of essential services. I regret that there has been any aspect of partisanship in the matter, and I am sure that where this has been injected it has been entirely on local levels. Yet because the issue has been raised I feel that I, as chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Post Office appropriation bill for 1948, must take cognizance of the charges that have been made, not only in defense of the majority party, but also of my colleagues on the minority who served faithfully on the subcommittee, who approached the question of appropriations in a nonpartisan manner, and who joined in submitting a unanimous report to the House. The bill was not amended on the floor nor by the full committee, and on March 11 the 1948 Post Office appropriation bill passed this body by a unanimous vote of 387-0. I therefore make it clear that it is my desire solely to state the position of the House, both majority and minority, in answering political charges that have been made against this bill.

In some localities carriers have advised the people whom they serve that deliveries will be made less frequently, or will be curtailed entirely, because insufficient money was appropriated. In the Post Office Department's appropriation bill for 1948, the House approved an appropriation of \$295,300,000 for city delivery service. This is \$7,300,000 more than

was available for this service in the current fiscal year. The amount passed by the House represents a reduction of only one-tenth of 1 percent from the budget requests, or only \$338,000 less than the President asked for. Obviously such a small reduction from the estimates would not have the effect of curtailing any carrier service.

I do not believe that it is the policy of the Post Office to curtail service, for the First Assistant Postmaster General made this statement to the subcommittee in February of this year:

During the war it was the policy of the Department to restrict city delivery service to the minimum requirements that will meet the bare needs of the public. Following the termination of the war the Department has been restoring this service to prewar standards as rapidly as practicable. Indicative of this is the fact that the number of regular city delivery carriers increased from 57,993 as of June 30, 1945, to 65,770 as of June 30, 1946, an increase of 7,777.

I have every reason to assume that postal officials in Washington are giving active consideration to the restoration of prewar delivery service, and I feel that the Congress is and has been cooperating with the Department in this respect. It is not only because two deliveries a day are a convenience to the public that such service should be restored as rapidly as possible, but also because mail held over night presents a storage problem for the local post offices, and facilities for this storage are not always available.

This House also has been most generous to the Post Office Department in providing for post office clerks. Even in the face of the Nation-wide demand for economy, the House increased the amounts granted for delivery service, and also placed the largest single increase in the bill, \$9,784,000 over the 1947 figures, for clerks in first and second class post offices. For this purpose \$487,000,000 was placed in the bill, a reduction of less than one-tenth of 1 percent, and this is in addition to \$24,000,000 for clerks in third class post offices—about half a million dollars more than granted in 1947.

It can be pointed out that during the month of March 1947, 2,529 people were added to the Post Office rolls, and 1,794 of these were in the bureau of the First Assistant Postmaster General, who has charge of clerk and delivery service.

I do not believe that the propaganda being put out now about curtailment of service due to insufficient appropriations made by the Republican-controlled Congress is inspired by the active authorities in the Post Office Department here in Washington.

The appropriation bill to which I am referring is the bill for the fiscal year 1948, which starts next July 1. The Post Office Department is at present running under appropriations for the fiscal year 1947 which were passed by the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress, and on page 1881 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 10, 1947, you will find the boast of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] that the Post Office subcommittee last year cut much deeper into the budget estimates for the

Post Office Department than did this year's subcommittee. On page 1886 you will find this statement by the former chairman of the appropriations committee, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], now ranking minority member:

As has been said, this bill cuts the estimates for the Post Office Department only \$14,000,000. Why, we cut the Post Office budget last year \$19,000,000. And this is not the most significant feature of it. They are cutting the \$14,000,000 this year from a budget which exceeds \$1,500,000,000. Last year we cut \$19,000,000 from a budget of only \$1,200,000,000.

Further along, the gentleman makes this statement:

You cannot point out a single dismissal in the entire Post Office Department.

And then he says this:

I deplore and deprecate the reckless and profligate extravagance of these spenders who now refuse to cut the budget on a \$1,500,000,000 estimate as much as we cut it last year on a \$1,200,000,000 estimate.

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] then asked this question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]:

Do I understand that in this bill which provides for 490,000 bureaucrats in the Post Office Department not one bureaucrat is cut off?

And Mr. CANNON answered:

Not one single bureaucrat. Not a single Communist. Not a single boondoggler. Of all the teeming hordes of parasites and chiselers and loafers and fan dancers and subversives we were told last November were infesting the Department of the Government, not a single one is being separated from his soft job in the entire Post Office Department. Every one of them is being retained by this bill—at the largest salaries ever paid in the history of the Government.

It is obvious that these members of the minority did not think then that there would be a curtailment of service under the 1948 bill. In fact, they objected that we did not cut more deeply and curtail some services.

And they also point out why there is any difficulty with the postal service today, and why in part it has been necessary for the Eightieth Congress to pass two deficiency appropriation bills to enable the Post Office to struggle along till June 30. If postal service is being curtailed today, my friends, it is because the Democratic-controlled Seventy-ninth Congress did not grant sufficient funds, and if the Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress had not approved two deficiency bills for the Post Office all service would have been drastically curtailed and severely crippled.

THE WOOL SITUATION

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about this wool situation. First of all, I wish to call the attention of my distinguished

colleague from Massachusetts to the fact that the bill he is opposing was sent to the House by the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Clinton P. Anderson, and was referred by our distinguished Speaker to the Committee on Agriculture.

I am sure that if he would look at the other side of this picture he would not really take the position he takes here today. I personally feel that the embarrassing wool situation is a result of the war. The first accumulation or stock pile we had in this country came as a result of the war. The first 300,000,000 pounds were brought over here from Australia to be kept safely so that the Japs could not get hold of it. We seem to forget the commitments we made to the rural people. Some people appear to think that those commitments are scraps of paper. There is too much of that attitude in the atmosphere at the present time. If any administration—I do not care what administration it is—desires during wartime to make definite, certain commitments and certain promises, then when the war is over say, "We are not going to follow them out," they can, if they so desire, take that position. I do not subscribe to such a position.

There is no reason to get into any partisan or political controversy in connection with this wool problem. This accumulation of 460,000,000 pounds of wool came as a result of the war. The wool people were promised a price that may seem high to some people, but it must be remembered that wool never skyrocketed like some other farm products did. It was frozen at that time. The price was frozen for the purpose of providing wool for the war. We cannot just walk out on the wool people. While wool showed a 14-percent advance in price, some other farm products doubled in price.

I say, in all fairness, if we are going to bring this wool bill on the floor and make a political football out of it, I am sure a lot of people are going to have a red face because, so far as the Republicans are concerned, we are trying to get our good Democratic friends out of a mess that they got themselves into. They should not be criticized for being in the mess either. I think every one of us owes an obligation to try to get rid of this 460,000,000 pounds of wool with the least possible loss to the United States Treasury. We should be sure that we do not ruin the sheep business in America too.

I say that for several reasons. First, we have not any forty or fifty million dollars to lose; second, if we go to work and lose forty to sixty million dollars on this wool program, together with the \$90,000,000 loss we sustained in supporting the potato price, part of which loss was due to maladministration, we might as well forget the whole Steagall amendment and the whole support program. Do you, my colleagues, wish to run out on the Steagall amendment?

Mr. Speaker, I hope when this bill comes on the floor of the House every Member will approach it from the standpoint that it is a war casualty, that we can get rid of that stock pile without any great loss to the United States Treasury;

that we should make a nonpartisan approach to iron out the problem.

I have listened about how wonderful this imported wool is, but I call attention to the fact that the wool which the boys in the American Army wore was domestic wool. It was good enough for them. If it was good enough for them it is good enough for the rest of the people of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, if and when the wool bill comes on the floor I hope we can approach consideration of it in such way that the bill will be passed unanimously; we need not think about any particular segment of this country but think about the welfare of the United States Treasury, the welfare of our country and about fulfilling the commitments we made during the war to the rural people of America. They have performed their work well and for the best interest of America we should religiously follow every commitment of the Steagall amendment.

SECOND ANNIVERSARY OF VE-DAY

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it is a singular coincidence that on this the second anniversary of VE-day we find ourselves still concerned about the plight of this troubled world.

Two full years have come and gone since our victory over Germany, which was followed a few months thereafter by a like victory over Japan. Surely all of us had a right to hope for peace, especially after the expenditure of such unprecedented quantities of both human life and wealth.

We have now for some days been debating the pending bill, which provides for financial assistance to Greece and Turkey, with the hope that we may thus further stay the hand of aggression and ultimately secure the peace we so much desire.

It is not easy to decide what position one should take concerning this important matter. We cannot take snap judgment in order to properly decide this important issue. We must not only call upon our own strength and wisdom but rely upon God Himself.

Our decision on this matter may, for all we know, determine the future of the entire world.

Years ago the poet Lowell gave us these lines:

Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood, for the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah, offering each the bloom or blight,
Parts the goats upon the left hand, and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

These lines seem to be most appropriate at this time. The passage of this bill is by no means absolute assurance that the free countries of Greece and Turkey will survive, but, in my judgment, the failure to pass the measure will mean

that the ever-expanding influence of communism will engulf these countries.

Turkey and Greece constitute the ramparts of democracy along the Mediterranean shores and we dare not longer sit supinely by and allow time to be swallowed up by communism where not even a semblance of freedom would be left.

Some weeks ago the President in a personal message delivered to us in this very Chamber pointed out the gravity of the international situation with reference to the spread of communism. The Senate after full and thorough hearings has already passed this measure. Our present great Secretary of State, a man with as comprehensive knowledge of world affairs as ever lived, has repeatedly urged the prompt and speedy enactment of this measure. Whether to follow or not to follow the President's program for aid to Greece and Turkey is a fateful and difficult decision to make, but the decision must be made and I am convinced that to decide against this measure would mean that we have all but forfeited our last hope for eventual universal peace.

We are standing today almost alone in this confused world demonstrating that a living, working democracy can live.

Our Nation alone holds out the hope for dispelling the fears for the future which now besets the world. We are leading the peoples of this earth by precept and example to that state of security and peace for which our sons have given their lives.

Ours is the responsibility for preserving and extending democracy and freedom. That responsibility cannot be shirked. Great Britain's international influence and power has been seriously impaired. We must take our rightful place of leadership. We can only exercise and discharge our responsibilities if we are alert and strong, and if we stand determined against the spread of communism.

The passage of this measure today will give heart and courage to our friends around the world. Our affirmative action will restore faith in democracy as a dynamic power for good throughout the earth. We must by our acts here and now further repudiate isolationism and appeasement in a world where these policies have and are leading us down the road to war.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'HARA (at the request of Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN), from May 8 to May 13, 1947, on account of official business.

To Mr. O'TOOLE (at the request of Mr. ROONEY), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON (at the request of Mr. SUNDSTROM), from May 8 to May 13, inclusive, on account of official business.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Lecompte, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that

that committee did on May 8, 1947, present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 173. An act to authorize the sale of certain public land in Alaska to Victory Bible Camp Ground, Inc.;

H. R. 326. An act for the relief of Wilma E. Baker;

H. R. 490. An act providing for the appointment of a United States commissioner for the Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas, and for other purposes;

H. R. 492. An act to authorize the juvenile court of the District of Columbia in proper cases to waive jurisdiction in capital offenses and offenses punishable by life imprisonment;

H. R. 729. An act to provide that the United States District Court for the Western District of Virginia shall alone appoint the United States commissioner for the Shenandoah National Park;

H. R. 804. An act authorizing the reduction of certain accrued interest charges payable by the Farmers' Irrigation District, North Platte project;

H. R. 1359. An act to amend the act of August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. 556), as amended, so as to increase the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the Corps of Civil Engineers of the Navy;

H. R. 1363. An act to amend further the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended;

H. R. 1365. An act to establish a Chief of Chaplains in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1367. An act to authorize the construction of experimental submarines, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1368. An act to include civilian officers and employees of the United States naval government of Guam among those persons who are entitled to the benefits of Public Law 490 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, approved March 7, 1942 (56 Stat. 143), as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1369. An act to amend the act entitled "An act providing for the reorganization of the Navy Department, and for other purposes," approved June 20, 1940, to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the President to appoint an Under Secretary of War during national emergencies, fixing the compensation of the Under Secretary of War, and authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe duties," approved December 16, 1940, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 1381. An act to amend the act of July 20, 1942 (56 Stat. 662), relating to the acceptance of decorations, orders, medals, and emblems by officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States tendered them by governments of belligerent nations or other American Republics;

H. R. 1605. An act to amend the act approved December 28, 1945 (59 Stat. 663), entitled "An act to provide for the appointment of additional commissioned officers in the Regular Army, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 8, 1946 (Public Law 670, 79th Cong.);

H. R. 2199. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Henry Big Day and other heirs of Catherine Shield Chief, deceased, to certain lands on the Crow Indian Reservation;

H. R. 2758. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the administration of the Washington National Airport, and for other purposes," approved June 29, 1940;

H. R. 2846. An act authorizing and directing the removal of stone piers in West Executive Avenue between the grounds of the White House and the Department of State Building;

H. J. Res. 90. An act to correct an error in the act approved August 10, 1946 (Public Law 720, 79th Cong., 2d sess.) relating to the composition of the Naval Reserve; and

H. J. Res. 116. An act to correct technical errors in the act approved August 13, 1946 (Public Law 729, 79th Cong., 2d sess.).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 9, 1947, at 10 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

663. A letter from the Chief Clerk, Court of Claims of the United States, transmitting a certified copy of the special findings of fact, conclusion of law, and opinion of the court in a case that was decided May 5, 1947; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

664. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed joint resolution authorizing the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to continue and establish offices in the territory of the Republic of the Philippines; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FELLOWS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 436. A bill for the relief of Roger Edgar Lapiere; without amendment (Rept. No. 339). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FARRINGTON:

H. R. 3376. A bill to ratify and confirm Act 10 of the Session Laws of Hawaii, 1947, extending the time within which revenue bonds may be issued and delivered under chapter 118, Revised Laws of Hawaii, 1945; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3377. A bill to amend section 73 of the Organic Act of Hawaii, relating to opening of agricultural lands for settlement; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3378. A bill relating to the completion of Everglades National Park in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 3379. A bill to amend the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act to include embezzled vehicles and aircraft; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 3380. A bill relating to the computation of Federal grants to States for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVITT:

H. R. 3381. A bill to amend parts VII and VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to extend the educational benefits granted therein to veterans of World War II to the widows and children of such veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 3382. A bill to amend part VII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to remove the

obligation of employers in certain on-the-job training programs of reporting payments of overtime salaries or wages to veteran trainees; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. R. 3383. A bill for the payment of claims of the Fidelity Trust Co., of Baltimore, Md., and others, covered by findings of fact made by the United States Court of Claims, dated June 5, 1944, and contained in Senate Document No. 229, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POULSON:

H. R. 3384. A bill to provide for regulation of certain insurance rates in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3385. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H. R. 3386. A bill relative to the promotion and pay of retired Army officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 149, a bill relative to restrictions applicable to Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Puerto Rico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact H. R. 2180, a bill which extends to Puerto Rico the benefits of the Reclamation Act; to the Committee on Public Lands.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to amend the housing laws in such manner as to allow the occupancy of housing units by families other than distressed families of servicemen and veterans with families to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. R. 3387. A bill for the relief of Bruce Bros. Grain Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of California:

H. R. 3388. A bill for the relief of John A. Hogg and Mrs. Leona Pearl Hogg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3389. A bill for the relief of Benedict Kleitsch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

H. R. 3390. A bill to provide that the name of Fred S. Knisley be added to the emergency officers' retired list of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

469. By Mr. BUFFETT: Petition of 33 citizens of Unadilla, Dunbar, and Syracuse, Nebr., urging favorable consideration and support of S. 265, a bill to prevent the interstate transmission of advertising of all alcoholic beverages and the broadcasting of such advertising by means of radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

470. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Petition of Mr. R. A. Sjobery, secretary, Federated Shop Crafts, Aberdeen, S. Dak., and 151 other signers requesting support to defeat H. R. 2169 and H. R. 2310, which propose to amend the so-called Crosser amendments; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

471. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of South Jersey Association of Water Superintendents, urging a restoration of the authorization for the United States Geological Survey to do ground-water work and that adequate funds be appropriated for such work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

472. By Mr. TOWE: Petition of the Englewood Zionist District, Englewood, N. J., relative to the Palestine question; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

473. By the SPEAKER: Petition of a New Haven emergency committee for displaced persons, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of H. R. 2910, the Stratton bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

474. Also, petition of the Board of Commissioners of the City of Bayonne, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to endorsement of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

475. Also, petition of the Model Agri-Piscifoultry and Cattle Farm, South Arcot district, India, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the availability of funds for a farm-trust plan in India; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MAY 9, 1947

(Legislative day of Monday, April 21, 1947)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton-Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose wisdom our finite minds cannot comprehend, we rejoice in the revelation which Thou hast made of Thyself as the guiding intelligence and the overruling Father.

Grant that in all the deliberations and decisions of this day we may be sensitive to the leading of Thy spirit, holding our own desires in abeyance until Thou dost declare Thy will. We pray that we may appropriate with increasing tenacity of faith the inexhaustible resources of Thy grace.

May it be the goal of our aspirations to attain unto the likeness of our blessed Lord. Help us to hasten the coming of that glorious day of prediction when the chasms which divide the members of the human family shall be bridged by friendship, and all the barriers which impede the progress of the Kingdom of Brotherhood shall be supplanted by the kind and gentle spirit of the Prince of Peace.

Hear us in His name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 8, 1947, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.